26752

National Library of Canada | Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE | THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/*NOM DE L'AUTEUR* Lydia Emanuel

TITLE OF THESIS/*TITRE DE LA THÈSE* Orthodox Ukrainian Identity

UNIVERSITY/*UNIVERSITÉ* University of Alberta

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ *GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE* Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/*ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE GRADE* 1975

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/*NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE* DR. Regna Darnell

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/*DATÉ* Sept. 18. '75 SIGNED/*SIGNÉ* L. Emanuel

PERMANENT ADDRESS/*RÉSIDENCE FIXÉ* 11403 Malmo Rd.
Edmonton Alberta
T6H 4N3

NL-91 (3-74)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

ATTITUDES TOWARDS IDENTITY IN A UKRAINIAN PARISH

by

© LYDIA EMANUEL

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 1975

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "Attitudes Towards Identity In A Ukrainian Parish" submitted by Lydia Emanuel in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Regna Darnell
Supervisor

David E Young

DATE September 19, 1975

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines Ukrainian-Canadian ethnic identity in a Ukrainian Orthodox parish in Edmonton, Alberta during the years 1972-73 following the release of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism findings and the Government's announcement of a multi-cultural programme. The orientation towards ethnic identity is analysed for three generations of Ukrainian-Canadians who were involved with the Saturday morning ethnic language school. The first generation consisted of post World War II immigrants who sent their children to the classes, while the second generation included Canadian-born adults as well as the immigrant children. The third generation was represented by the children of the Canadian-born adults. Qualitative and quantitative aspects of their identity are explored. This thesis also examines the future of the Ukrainian ethnic group by evaluating their responses against two basic models: assimilation, and cultural autonomy, favouring the latter model.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the members of my study committee for their time and effort in providing me with the necessary guidance and insight to complete this project.

To Dr. Regna Darnell, my committee chairman, I owe a special debt, as her own scholarly contributions to the study of Canadian multiculturalism (which are acknowledged repeatedly throughout the text) were instrumental in bringing my interest in this area to a focus. I am particularly grateful for her patience and direction through the initial drafts of this thesis.

I would also like to thank the other members of my committee for the special contribution that each made: Dr. David Young, for his assistance in organizing the data into more structured form; Dr. Rod Wilson for his comments on technical aspects of the data and on Chapter II; Dr. Ivan Rudnytsky of the History Department for acting as my outside examiner and helping me to understand the historical aspects of Ukrainian immigration to Canada; and Dr. Anthony Vanek, formerly of the Department of Slavic Studies who served as an informal member as far as circumstances permitted.

I owe my sincere thanks to the goodwill and warmth of the Ukrainian-Canadians, particularly from the northside parish, who participated in this study, and without whose cooperation this project would have been impossible. In addition, I must thank Dr. J. B. Rudnyckyj, former member of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism whose research assistant I was in 1970, and who "started the ball rolling."

I would like to thank my parents who taught me to appreciate the

values of "multiculturalism" long before the word came into popular use, and my typist, Mollie R. Calvert, who ably performed her task.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the firm support and encouragement that I received from my husband, Gene, who did the tedious calculations and never hesitated to help in every way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
INTRODUCTION		1
CHAPTER		
I.	HISTORY OF UKRAINIAN IMMIGRATION TO CANADA	10
	The Ancient Historical Background of the Ukraine	10
	The First Ukrainians in Canada	16
	Religious Conflict Within the Group	25
	Political Events in the Ukraine Prior to the Second Immigration	28
	The Effects on Canadian-Ukrainians	30
	The Second Wave of Immigrants	31
	Contributions of the Second Wave of Immigrants	32
	The Third Wave of Immigrants	36
	Impact of the Third Wave of Immigrants	38
II.	THEORETICAL APPROACH	43
	The Assimilation Model	44
	The Organization of Diversity Approach	48
	Organization of Diversity and Ethnic Studies	49
III.	THE PARISH	58
	The Population	58
	Methodology	60
IV.	QUALITATIVE DATA	63
	Conclusions	80
V.	QUANTITATIVE DATA	85
	The Hypotheses	87
	Summary of Statistical Findings	94

CHAPTER PAGE

VI. DISCUSSION 97

The First Generation 98

The Second Generation 103

The Third Generation 113

Summary 119

VII. CONCLUSION 125

***

BIBLIOGRAPHY 131

APPENDIX 1. The Questionnaire 136

APPENDIX 2. Determination of the Ethnic Score 142

APPENDIX 3. Contingency Tables 156

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
1.	Ukrainian Immigration to Canada from 1897-1900	19
2.	Ukrainian Immigration to Canada from 1925-1946	33
3.	Ukrainian Immigration to Canada from 1947-1965	36
4.	The Assimilation Variables	44
5.	Generational Differences in Orientation Towards Ethnicity	51
6.	Amount of Ukrainian Spoken in the Home Among Members of the Same Family	65
7.	Why Is It Good to Learn Ukrainian (First Generation Adults)?	69
8.	Why Is It Good to Learn Ukrainian (Second Generation Adults and Children)?	69
9.	Why Is It Good to Learn Ukrainian (Third Generation Children)?	71
10.	Giving Household Pets Ukrainian Names	74
11.	Summary of Statistical Findings	94

INTRODUCTION

The primary motivations for this study derive from (1) a desire to understand the nature of Ukrainian Canadian Orthodox identity especially in the area of native language and (2) the hope that conclusions drawn from this research will contribute to an understanding of ethnic group dynamics and perhaps influence the strategy of those ethnic groups who are interested in determining their own future course.

Prior to the establishment of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism in 1963, very little notice was generally taken of Canadian non-French and non-native minority groups. However, a rapid appraisal of the number of studies listed in Gregorovich's Canadian Ethnic Groups Bibliography (1972) attests to the striking increase in interest that began in the mid sixties.

It was the growing dissatisfaction among French Canadians mainly in the province of Quebec (where more than eighty per cent of its population of five million is French-speaking--Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Preliminary Report 1965: 194) that prompted the Canadian government to investigate how best to enforce French linguistic and cultural rights outlined in the British North America Act of 1867. The task of the Royal Commission was to

> . . . inquire into and report upon the existing state of bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada and to recommend what steps should be taken to develop the Canadian Confederation on the basis of an equal partnership between the two founding races, taking into account the contribution made by the other ethnic groups to the cultural enrichment of Canada and the measures that should be taken to safeguard that contribution. . .

(Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1969: 235).

The terms of the mandate were also reflected in the selection of the original ten Commissioners whose number corresponded to the equal weight constitutionally accorded to the French and the British groups, with two (judging on the basis of surnames) representatives from the collective category, "other ethnic groups," assigned in approximate proportion to the number of those of neither French nor British extraction in the population.

However, the case for nation-wide recognition and acceptance of bilingualism and biculturalism failed to receive the support of very many western Canadians, notably in the three Prairie Provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta, where forty-eight to fifty-two per cent of the three million inhabitants are not of French or British origin (Ibid.: 260-264). In addition, the settlement pattern of the Canadian West has been such that regional ethnic blocs still survive (Flanagan 1971: 141; Pohorecky and Royick 1969: 148) with some communities where the residents have been from the same ("other") ethnic group for generations.

Some of the most vociferous challenges vis-a-vis the validity of the Commission's mandate were made by Ukrainian-Canadians who attended the regional meetings in the greatest numbers (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Preliminary Report 1965: 29), and whose representative organizations flooded the Commission with the largest volume of position papers and briefs relative to the group's size (1969: 85).

The Ukrainians comprise slightly over two and a half per cent of Canada's population, but they account for twenty-eight per cent of the population of the Prairie Provinces (Ibid.: 260-264) in a manner similar

to the concentration of French-Canadians in the region of Quebec. After the French and British who make up forty-seven to fifty-two per cent of the Prairie population, Ukrainians are exceeded only by Germans (thirty-one per cent), who are the only other ethnic group to outnumber them on the national level as well (Ibid.: 248).

The argument of numbers coupled with the conviction that Ukrainians were effectively responsible for the colonization of the West (Kaye 1964: xv; Maslanyk and Chomiak 1967: 178; Yuzyk 1953: 43) was felt to be sufficient justification to merit equally special consideration (see also Rudnyckyj 1973: 124) on the extension of official linguistic privileges to Ukrainians. The concept of the two founding races, i.e. French and British, was categorically rejected by those who believed it detracted from the impact of their own cultural contributions to Canada and reduced them to second class citizens (Slawuta 1972: 137; in Palmer 1971: 110; Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Preliminary Report 1965: 50).

Ukrainians still claiming Ukrainian as their mother tongue number close to sixty-five per cent of Ukrainians in Canada (Ibid. 1969: 336). In the Prairie Provinces, the figures are even more impressive--from nearly seventy per cent to seventy-two per cent (Ibid.), significantly outstripping the retention rate of all sizeable "other" ethnic groups in the region. In spite of these reassuring figures, Ukrainians nevertheless voiced fear that the Government's emphasis upon French as the other official language would be made at the expense of Ukrainian, especially if French and English were presented as the two languages that were most relevant. By the same token, it was feared that the decreased importance of Ukrainian would lead to its eventual disappearance and promote

the assimilation of the group (Lupul 1971: 15; Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club of Edmonton 1972: 13-14), and the majority of the protests registered by Ukrainian-Canadians reflected this concern.

The confrontation with western Canadian ethnic groups was instructive for members of the Commission to the extent that it awakened their awareness:

> We thus began to understand and measure the importance of the cultural riches which they brought with them and which they wish to preserve. We know their difficulties a little better, but also their pride and their feeling of belonging to Canada.
>
> (1965: 126)

Although the Royal Commission refused to recognize the existence of a "third force" in any but a statistical sense, referring to it simply as a term for those of other than French or British extraction wishing to emphasize their distinctness (1969: 10), the Commission nevertheless acknowledged that Ukrainian-Canadians consciously "take a lead in efforts to organize a third force" (Ibid.: 85), and numerous researchers not necessarily of Ukrainian origin themselves, (Wangenheim 1971; Stearns 1967) recognize them as such.

It was the embarrassing and pointed questions raised by representatives of the "third force" (for example, Rudnyckyj 1967) that prompted demands for renewed interest and research into the nature of the accommodation of the other ethnic groups in Canadian society.

There is every indication that Canadian ethnic groups will continue to be the subject of controversy and discussion for other, albeit related reasons. Largely on the basis of the recommendations made by the Royal Commission at the end of Book IV (The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups), especially Paragraph 14

> We recommend that the appropriate federal, provincial and municipal agencies receive the financial means they require to maintain and extend their support to cultural and research organizations whose objectives are to foster the arts and letters of cultural groups other than the British and French,
>
> (1969: 230)

and amidst speculation that it was to ensure the loyalty and support of disconcerted ethnic groups (in Palmer 1971: 110; Vanek and Darnell: in press), the Federal government announced its multiculturalism programme in 1971. Essentially it was a promise of support for cultural and linguistic goals enunciated by the other ethnic groups within the appropriate bilingual framework. The new policy was an extremely important event in the ontogeny of the other ethnic groups on at least two levels: (1) it represented a significant departure from the former bicultural definition of Canadian society as set forth by the Royal Commission, and has created some resentment among members of the British and French groups (Palmer 1971: 109-111); (2) as such, it officially recognized, for the first time, the rights of ethnic groups to pursue their own destiny. It is in the latter area that ethnic groups have become aware of their heightened visibility, and in many cases, a reappraisal and clearer formulation of their capabilities have become necessities as never before if their full potential is to be reached.

This study is an attempt to elucidate the nature of Ukrainian-Canadian identity with special emphasis on language maintenance effectiveness in a partial response to the problem posed in (2).

Ukrainians in Canada belong to two main religions, Orthodox and Greek Catholic. There are major historical as well as dogmatic differences between the two groups to this day. Greek Catholics are directly responsible to the Pope, and celibacy is mandatory for the clergy. The

Orthodox group is essentially Ukrainian nationalist, because it was formed in Canada and recognizes no patriarch. Priests are encouraged to marry before ordination (Yuzyk 1953: 75-76). Greek Catholics outnumber Greek Orthodox Ukrainians on a nation-wide basis by eight per cent (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1969: 301).

As is the case with some of the other ethnic groups, a number of researchers have noted the close connection between the parish church and the retention of ethnic identity for Ukrainians (Bociurkiw 1969: 31; Millett 1971: 50; Kellner 1965: 151). Thus, an Edmonton Ukrainian Orthodox parish was chosen as a focus of study for ethnic identity. Orthodox Ukrainians are more numerous in Edmonton (13,000) than Greek Catholics (9000) (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1969: 315).

The maintenance of the native language has been an important factor in the preservation of the ethnic heritage. A limited command of the language acts as an inhibiting factor for cultural continuity in the sense that it restricts participation and exposure to certain kinds of ethnic influences (Bociurkiw 1969: 21) such as the Ukrainian printed media, literary works, radio and television, etc. Speaking Ukrainian is one of the cornerstones of Ukrainian-Canadian identity as far as a number of Ukrainian-Canadian opinion leaders are concerned (Ukrainian Women's Association of Canada 1973: 1; Sarchuk 1972: 9-11; Bilotserkivets 1970: 1-2), however it is not necessarily the only one.

Language is an outward symbol of ethnic identity, and in its capacity as a vehicle of identity it may be replaced by another symbol--i.e. another language, equally capable of functioning at the same level provided that a number of other conditions continue to be met.

The Royal Commission argues that

> . . . people are more ready to use an alien tongue for business or political activity than for worship or confession. Churches have tried to profit from this feeling and hold their flocks by offering language classes for children.
>
> (1969: 100)

It is argued here that the suggestion that church membership and attendance depends so greatly on the existence of language classes is partially incorrect. Although the predominant view may be that language maintenance is the cornerstone of continuing Ukrainian identity (see page 6), here it will be argued that it is less of a factor for some Ukrainians than for others. In brief, the Ukrainian Orthodox Mass or Liturgy is a fairly lengthy church service which often exceeds its basic two hour time span whenever regular Sundays coincide with other religious days requiring special observations of their own. All church rituals are traditionally performed in the native language which often has the effect of discouraging non-speakers from remaining in the parish. However, many adults and children continue to attend who know little of the language but nevertheless maintain a desire to leave things as they are (Emanuel 1974). Limited facility in Ukrainian, but high interest and participation in ethnic organizations and in language teaching schools must also put to question the view that only those whose native language is Ukrainian can have a strong sense of ethnic identity. While it may be true that many Canadian-born individuals of Ukrainian ancestry have retained the native language and are interested in perpetuating their heritage, the general feeling among members of the ethnic community is that this is applicable only to second generation Ukrainians. Third generation Ukrainians frequently have English as their native language,

and the feeling among many of the strongly nationalistic first generation immigrants who arrived after the Second World War is to disparage third generation ethnicity.

It has been close to thirty years since the last major wave of Ukrainian immigrants arrived, and indications are that the situation will not change appreciably. Thus, it becomes necessary to reconsider and examine the nature of ethnic identity among all those of Ukrainian ancestry who count themselves as members of the ethnic group. An assessment of the potential contribution of third generation Ukrainians is particularly important inasmuch as (1) the Federal government has provided the incentive and the means to encourage ethnic groups to preserve their traditions; and (2) the third generation will soon form the bulk of those of Ukrainian ancestry in Canada.

In order to facilitate exploration of Ukrainian (Orthodox) identity in one parish where the active membership is composed of three generations, the following outline will be used:

Chapter One will consist of an historical account of Ukrainian settlement in Canada with necessary references to the history of the Ukraine. The purpose of this chapter will be to establish a perspective on Ukrainian immigration and to anchor the major developments affecting Orthodox Ukrainians in their full context--i.e. the formation of the Orthodox Church, abolition of bilingual schools, current Soviet politics, etc.

The second chapter will focus upon the composition of an ethnic group; a generalized model involving generational differences in expression of ethnicity will be presented to describe Ukrainian Orthodox eth-

nic identity.

Chapter Three will present the methodological approach of this study, discussing the population that was sampled in the parish.

Chapter Four will consist of a presentation and discussion of the qualitative data.

The fifth chapter will consist of hypotheses, other qualitative data, and chi-square analysis results.

The sixth chapter will endeavour to combine the qualitative and quantitative data from the previous two chapters in an effort to secure a picture of ethnic identity in the parish. A summary will follow.

Chapter Seven will be the concluding chapter in which implications for the future development of the Ukrainian group in Canada will be discussed.

CHAPTER I

HISTORY OF UKRAINIAN IMMIGRATION TO CANADA

One of the greatest difficulties in documenting the history of Ukrainians in Canada derives from political events in Europe which obscured and fragmented their national identity; it was not uncommon for many to refer to themselves as Galicians, Austrians, Hungarians, Bukovinians, Poles, Russians, and Ruthenians according to the many partitions and political allegiances that were formed during the time in which the first and second major flow of Ukrainians came to Canada. Thus, significant portions of that history are forever lost.

The Ancient Historical Background of the Ukraine

Ukrainians are the descendents of Slavic tribes who inhabited an area between the Upper Dniester, the Pripet, and the Dnieper Rivers (Yuzyk 1953: 6). In 862, Vikings from Scandinavia, engaged in settlement and exploration, brought a number of the tribes under their rule, resulting in a confederacy or state named Rus by its inhabitants. It focussed around the present city of Kiev which was its capital.

The cultural florescence of Rus came into being with the reign of Prince Vladimir the Great and was largely attributable to the after-effects of his adoption of Christianity from Constantinople (Greek Orthodoxy) in 988 (Krypiakevych 1961: 19; Trident Press 1966: 24). Under the impact of Byzantine culture, schools and churches sprang up. The arrival of Greek craftsmen who were architects, goldsmiths, and pain-

ters in church-related trades, stimulated the commerce of the state (Hrushevsky 1943: 69). As the power of Kiev grew, Vladimir annexed a number of other tribes to his kingdom and Kievan Rus extended from the Black Sea to the Baltic, and from the Danube River and Carpathian Mountains to the Volga River and the Urals (Yuzyk 1953: 7). Vladimir appointed his sons to administer in the various regions, retaining the main seat of power at Kiev.

By the year 1054, a schism occurred within the Christian Church which divided the hierarchy into eastern and western factions. Ukrainians were under the jurisdiction of Constantinople from the first, and therefore they automatically followed the Orthodox Church. Centuries later, this would result in the polarization of Ukrainians between two camps, not only in Europe, but in Canada as well.

The Ukraine's geographical location and proximity to Asia rendered the Kievan state under constant threat of attack from surrounding Asian tribes. It was petty quarreling among the various apponage princes for possession of Kiev, coupled with successive attacks commencing in the early thirteenth century by Mongolian Tatars, that resulted in the capture and virtually complete destruction of Kievan Rus in 1240. Only the remoter regions of Galicia and Volynia continued to flourish as the last remnants of Kievan Rus for another century. The name "Ukrayina" (Ukraine) was already in use, and appeared in chronicles as early as 1187 (Ibid.: 13).

To the north of Kievan Rus, a number of Finnish and Slavic tribes acknowledged Moscow, (formed in 1147), as a centre of power (Ibid.: 9). With the decline of Kievan Rus, many Ukrainians fled to the north and west, settling with the Muscovites, and in Galicia and Volynia in west-

ern Ukraine (Young 1931: 17).

Lithuanians, who were further removed from the threat of Tatar invasion, succeeded in amassing sufficient strength to stem the Mongolian advance and to drive the Tatars back from the territories of Kievan Rus, installing themselves as rulers by 1350 (Yuzyk 1953: 10) and eventually extending their rule as far as Volynia. Lithuanian rule was accepted for the protection it afforded, and also because Lithuanian policy was one of non-interference in Ukrainian institutions and affairs (Ibid.; Trident Press 1966: 83).

The marriage of Polish and Lithuanian royalty in 1386 resulted in a dynastic union between these two countries. By 1569, the Polish-Lithuanian Royal House ceased to exist, and Ukrainian lands were transferred from the Lithuanian, to the Polish half of the union as per the terms of the Union of Lublin.

The Poles had acknowledged the Western Patriarch after the schism in the Christian Church and were consequently Roman Catholics. Catholicism was the popular, and indeed, socially advantageous religion in Poland at the time. The capture of Constantinople by Turks in 1453 weakened the influence of the Greek Orthodox Church as well, with the result that some Ukrainian bishops agreed to the terms of the Act of Union in 1596 which resulted in the creation of what became the Greek Catholic Church.

> It recognized the authority of the Pope in matters of dogma and accepted the Gregorian Calendar (later it was renounced). The Orthodox rite, using the old Slavonic in liturgy and ceremonies, was left unchanged, except that the form of communion was to be decided by the Pope. The priests were not required to take the vow of celibacy and could marry before ordination. The bishops were promised a seat in the Polish Senate and were to be equal with Roman Catholic prelates. . . .
>
> (Ibid.)

In order to avoid the pressures of Polish feudalism and Catholicism, many fled the western Ukraine to inhabit the steppes or prairies in the east. Subject to frequent Turkish and Tatar raids as well as skirmishes with the Poles, a number of Ukrainians became Cossacks. Young translates the original meaning of the word as "free booter" (1931: 19), indicating their desire to be free of foreign rule.

The Cossacks were fiercely Greek Orthodox and built up powerful military organizations headed by Hetmans. In 1648 under Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky, they drove the Poles out of east central Ukraine and re-established a new Ukrainian state. The country was called both Rus and Ukrayina, and sometimes Rus-Ukrayina and Ukrayina Rus (Yuzyk 1953: 13).

To strengthen his position against further threat from Poles and Turks, Khmelnytsky accepted Russia's protectorate in the year 1654. The agreement was called the Treaty of Pereyaslav and has since been held responsible by many for the collapse of the Ukraine until modern times (Shevchenko 1958: 185; Yuzyk 1953: 12).

As early as 1240 when Kievan Rus fell to the Tatars, the principality of Moscow began to rise steadily on the north-east periphery of the former Kievan state, incorporating a considerable amount of Ukrainian culture into its own. The Treaty of Pereyaslav gave Muscovites additional reason to establish a foothold in Ukraine and in 1654 Alexis declared himself "Tsar of all the Great, Little, and White Rus" (Ibid.), designating himself as successor to Little Rus, or the Cossack state.

Thereafter, in an effort to crush Ukrainian strivings for independence, Russia and Poland came to an agreement in 1667, and partitioned the Ukraine. The two countries divided the Ukraine with the Dnieper

River as the boundary. Tsar Peter renamed his state the Russian Empire, and discouraged the use of other designations, including Ukrayina. The Metropolitancy of Kiev, one of the foci of Ukrainian Orthodoxy, lost its autonomy in order to facilitate "unity in spirit of the Russian people." (Martowych 1952: 25) Ukrainians were forced to acknowledge the Patriarch of Moscow as their canonical head in the government effort to establish a national Orthodox faith. During this time, Poland was beset by internal problems involving Parliamentary reforms and the countries of Prussia, Austria, and Russia took advantage of the situation, each partitioning Poland between 1772 and 1795. Russia claimed the greater part of Poland, while Austria took Galicia. Under Austrian rule which grew less restrictive by the 1880's, western Ukraine gradually became a centre of nationalistic revival for Ukrainians.

It was true that Ukrainian peasants were largely illiterate and that the gentry and urban dwellers looked upon them with considerable disdain. However, a shift in interest occurred, resulting from the successes of the French and American Revolutions, and the defeat of Napoleon. A new movement arose which favoured the adoption of a more democratic attitude and emphasized elements of folk culture. The movement is referred to in historical literature as Romantic Nationalism (Hrushevsky 1943: 479). Intellectuals ceased to look for inspiration to Greek and Roman literature and concentrated upon local traditions and popular legends (Ibid.).

In the Ukraine, the wave of interest led to the revival of literature dealing with the heroic exploits of the Cossacks and of the glorious days before Ukraine had been partitioned by Poland, and by Poland and Russia. The movement significantly affected Ukrainians under both

Austrian and Russian rule.

In Russia, interest in Ukrainian folk culture was tolerated as long as it was non-political and did not threaten the regime. As soon as it seemed that it might, there were efforts to curtail the use of the Ukrainian language. In 1863,

> The Minister of the Interior, Valuiev, issued an order forbidding the publication of Ukrainian books in general. The only reason given for his act was that "the majority of Little Russians prove conclusively that there never was any separate Little Russian language, there is not one now, and there cannot be one," and that the Ukrainian movement was being stirred up by the Poles for their own benefit. Thereafter, he ordered the censor in future to permit the publication in Ukrainian of belles-lettres only, but to deny the right to print scientific works or books intended for popular reading . . . the Russian Orthodox Synod furthermore prohibited the publication of all Ukrainian books, including belles-lettres. . . .
> (Hrushevsky 1943: 496)

Writers and intellectuals therefore used the western Ukraine as a centre of publication. From there, books published in Ruthenian, as the Ukrainian language was called under Austrian rule (Ibid.: 473), were smuggled into eastern Ukraine. Many of the Ukraine's greatest writers, such as Shevchenko, wrote and contributed to the revival of Ukrainian nationalist sentiment during that time.

In 1866, numerous Austrian-held territories were affected in the wave for self-determination and nationalist aspirations within the Germanic Confederation. In an effort to recover some of her political power, Austria acknowledged Hungary as its partner in a dual monarchy in order to secure its support (Yuzyk 1953: 15). Austria then agreed to grant autonomy to Galicia, but under Polish auspices. The polish administration was not entirely successful in suppressing the Ukrainian nationalist movement, and the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church emerged as one of the greatest defenders of the cultural revival. As it was neither

based upon Russian-imposed Orthodoxy nor Polish Roman Catholicism, it remained as the only church retaining much of the Ukrainian culture.

The First Ukrainians In Canada

The traditional date of entry of the first Ukrainians into Canada is 1891, although there are reports of numerous Ukrainian individuals in the de Watteville and de Meuron regiments (Royick, in Pohorecky and Royick 1969: 152) and with the Selkirk Settlers which antedate this period (Marunchak 1958: 28).

The factors that prompted the first immigration in the 1890's were many and varied, and must be considered within the context of the political background of the time. The majority came from Galicia and Bukovina in western Ukraine. Bukovinians were Greek Orthodox to a greater degree, having been under Turkish-Moldavian rule and largely unaffected by developments in Galicia. Kaye writes that the first immigrants were primarily small landowners who had come to the limit of making a living off the land after many successive divisions of inheritance (1964: xiii). Overpopulation, heavy taxes, and friction with Polish gentry undoubtedly contributed also.

There were two divergent opinions held by the intelligentsia in connection with different nationalist goals for the development of the western Ukraine. One faction advocated only migration for seasonal work which would not detract from the Ukrainian population in an absolute numerical sense. They were also reluctant to see Ukrainian-owned landholdings turned over to non-Ukrainians who could afford the price whenever potential immigrants tried to sell their possessions (Marunchak 1968: 31). The other group supported the conservatives to the extent

that they advocated the establishment of co-operatives to regulate the sale of land. Nevertheless, the effects of overpopulation were seen as undesirable and emigration was seen as the solution.

Orderly emigration was stressed by one influential agricultural economist named Oleskiw in an attempt to protect unwary peasants from unscrupulous ticket agents who were directing immigration to Brazil at that time. Slavery had recently been abolished in that country, and plantation owners needed a supply of cheap labour which they continued to mistreat (Ibid.: 32). Peasants in the eastern Ukraine had less motivation to leave, largely because there was free land to be had in Asiatic Russia.

The arrival of the very first immigrants in Canada was the result of the experiences of Ivan Pylypiw, a peasant who had learned about North America during his four years in the village school, and subsequently discussed the notion of emigrating with German co-workers who already had relatives living in Canada. During the course of his first visit to Canada, Pylypiw entered into a business transaction with the travel agent in Hamburg whereby he would receive five dollars for each family he brought to the agent's ticket office. Villagers who had learned of this pact were suspicious of his motives and reluctant to believe his claims about unoccupied farm lands to be had for the asking (in Chumer 1942: 20).

Nevertheless, a handful of families consisting of thirty-three persons followed his advice and settled in the Chipman area of Alberta. By 1894, six families arrived at Star, now named Edna, Alberta, and by 1895 there were several hundred Ukrainians in western Canada (Pohorecky and Royick 1969: 152).

In Lviv, Galicia, Canada had been brought to the attention of Dr. Joseph Oleskiw, an agricultural economist who had published a number of pamphlets on the need for emigration, and warning of the dangers of settling in Brazil (Kaye 1964: 12). He wrote to the Canadian Department of the Interior, requesting additional information about the climate, agricultural possibilities, and the prospects for directing a large number of "Galician agriculturalists of Ruthenian (Slavic) nationality who although of modest means, are diligent and thrifty" (Ibid.: 2), to Canada.

The Canadian Prime Minister at that time, Wilfrid Laurier, had appointed Clifford Sifton as Minister of the Interior, to "carry out the threefold concurrent policy of railway expansion, immigration, and settlement" (Yuzyk 1953: 29). The initial task of attracting immigrants had been begun under the leadership of Bowell (Marunchak 1968: 68; Simpson in Kaye 1964: x) and was accelerated by Sifton who was extremely interested in Oleskiw's proposals. Oleskiw was invited to tour Canada at considerable government expense and was unofficially made the Canadian representative for Austrian-Galician immigration (Kaye 1964: 103). Under the combined efforts of Oleskiw and Canadian government officials, Ukrainian immigration reflected a steady increase. In 1893 there were 254; in 1894, 616; in 1895, 489; and in 1896 after Dr. Oleskiw's letter, 1275 (Marunchak 1968: 56). The heavy immigration lasted until 1914 when it was halted by the First World War by which time approximately 200,000 Ukrainians had come to Canada (Yuzyk 1953: 31; in Pohorecky and Royick 1969: 154).

Figures for Ukrainians are confusing on account of the diverse nomenclature (Kaye 1964: xxiv) employed by the immigrants, and the

Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Ukrainians

> . . . did not know how to designate themselves except under the ancient name of "Rusin." As subjects of Austria they were officially known as Ruthenians. . . . The Dominion Bureau of Statistics preferred to designate these people according to the territory from which they came. Thus the Ukrainians are found registered as Galicians, Bukovinians, Austrians, Rumanians, Hungarians and Russians; some were registered as Poles. . . . Many of these people were classified as Russians because of the interpretation attached to the word "Rusin.". . .
>
> (Yuzyk 1953: 36)

Although the number of Ukrainians are undoubtedly underrepresented, Marunchak cites the following proportion as having arrived from Galicia and Bukovina only:

TABLE 1

UKRAINIAN IMMIGRATION 1897-1900

	General Number of Immigrants to Canada	Immigrants from Galicia and Bukovina
1897	21,717	4,999
1898	31,900	5,509
1899	44,543	7,276
1900	41,681	6,618

(1968: 55)

More significant than the figures themselves was the tendency for immigrants to settle together in large numbers (Young 1931: 70) often causing long-resident Anglo-Saxons to observe that "We are the foreigners here" (Young 1931: 76). In discussing the unfavourable aspects of Ukrainian settlement Young also notes that

> It is unnecessary to labour the point that blocs of this size, permeated with the atmosphere of the old world and composed of members

knit together by the common recollection of neighbourly associations in the past, are inimical to the assimilation of these people. "The question of assimilation," says Fairchild, "is largely a question of contact between the newcomer and the native born population," and if there is one thing the blocs do it is to prevent contacts with the native born. This has been convincingly demonstrated by any surveys which have been made of their settlements, surveys which have held in common these two conclusions:

1. That where they are thickly settled in large compact groups of their own nationality, their development economically, socially, educationally, etc., has been noticeably slow.

2. And conversely, that where they are mixed to any extent with groups of other nationalities they progress much more rapidly.

(Ibid.)

Bloc settlement, however, was largely the result of limited amounts of farmland available for Ukrainian immigrants who were given whatever lands remained unclaimed since the opening of the west.

Although the German population increased from 46,800 in 1901 to 148,000 in 1911, and the number of Scandinavians rose from 17,300 to 130,000 during the same period (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1969: 22), pressure for them to assimilate was of a different order, and, except for resentment registered against certain sectarian groups, public opinion was not as hostile to their coming until the First World War when Germans were classified as potential enemies. Indeed, the association of Germans with the United Empire Loyalists who were supporters of the British Crown, and certain cultural similarities with those of the Anglo-Saxon majority (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1969: 83) undoubtedly contributed to their acceptance. Both groups were praised for the relative ease with which they assimilated into Canadian (Anglo-Saxon) society (Young 1931: 293-294; Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1969: 56 on Icelandic acceptance of English language instruction).

Ukrainians, on the other hand, perceived Canada as the place where they could be free to pursue a quality of life that was impossible under Austrian rule. Early Ukrainian folksongs originating in Canada, reflected this new freedom with particular emotionalism (in Klymasz 1970). Consequently, attempts to "Canadianize" them were not received enthusiastically by the majority who interpreted government attempts to increase English language exposure, discredit old country customs, and criticize bloc settlements, as persecution to be likened to the treatment they had received in Europe.

Ukrainians were conspicuous in a number of other ways that made their socio-economic position unenviable and subject to attack. Poor sanitary conditions and over-crowding on the ships that brought them, and later, hastily constructed homes, contributed to their reputation for being diseased and dirty (The Daily Nor'Wester, in Marunchak 1968: 73). As peasants and recent immigrants, they were accustomed to a lower standard of living than many of the long-time residents they came into contact with (Yuzyk 1953: 43; Young 1931: 77) and were criticized for being unprogressive and for retarding the development of the West (The Daily Nor'Wester, in Marunchak 1968: 73-74). There was a certain amount of self-assurance and pride in British institutions and relative prosperity on the part of British workers who called themselves "whitemen" to distinguish themselves from European immigrants (Palmer 1972: 75) who naturally included a very large number of Ukrainians at that time. With the exception of Asians on the west coast of Canada who were discriminated against on racial grounds, Ukrainians came under considerably more criticism than any other sizeable Prairie group on account of their

reluctance to adapt to Canadian ways. They were variously referred to as "Sifton's Pets," "Sifton's Sheepskins" and "the scum of Europe" (Yuzyk 1953: 41) and Sifton was accused of overindulgence and favoratism for allowing such large numbers to come (Marunchak 1968: 71).

A particularly explosive issue revolved around English-Ukrainian bilingual schools. English-speaking instructors often refused to take teaching positions in predominantly Ukrainian settlements because such settlements were thought to be backward (Yuzyk 1953: 145). Ukrainians furthermore rejected English language teaching as a vehicle of assimilation reminiscent of Polish absorption policies (Ibid.). They advocated the enforcement of the Laurier-Greenway Act (1897) to be extended to themselves as it applied to French-Canadians and Germans. The terms of the Act were as follows:

> . . . where ten of the pupils speak the French language, or any other language other than English, as their native language, the teaching for such pupils shall be conducted in French, or such other language, and English upon the bilingual system.
>
> (in Yuzyk 1953: 145)

In response to these factors--i.e. lack of qualified instructors, and legality of the Act, the Manitoba government was the first to establish a special Ruthenian Training School to educate bilingual teachers of Ukrainian origin capable of providing bilingual instruction in Ukrainian settlements.

Unfortunately, the extension of linguistic privileges to any ethnic groups satisfying the minimal requirements, resulted in much confusion and disorganization.

> Serious conflicts arose in ethnically mixed school districts, particularly in view of the fact that their ethnic composition changed frequently. . . . It was, for instance, found that in five school

> districts separate minority schools could have been requested by no less than three different minority groups, had they chosen to do so. In 110 school districts, one or more local ethnic minorities had to send their children to schools which were taught in the language of another minority, for instance, Polish children were forced to attend Ruthenian schools, Finnish children Polish schools, and so on. In such districts the arrival or departure of a single family could alter the situation at any time and deprive the majority of its precarious privilege.

(Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1969: 104).

Assimilationists were quick to point out that bilingual schools prevented integration and repeatedly emphasized that

> In the French, Polish, and Ruthenian settlements of Manitoba the English language is but poorly understood and indifferently spoken by the children and by a considerable number of the adult population. The Liberals contend that this condition represents not only a wrong inflicted upon these children individually, but a prejudice to the entire province and to the entire dominion. For this condition of things means that the French children and the Polish and Ruthenian children are being unprepared not only to make their own way in life, but unprepared also for the responsibilities of Canadian citizenship and the burdens of Canadian nationality.
>
> (in Marunchak 1968: 150)

Similar attacks on the issue of bilingual schools occurred in Saskatchewan as well. The Alberta government, however, refused to lend any support for bilingual schools, drawing on the evidence of disorderliness in the other two Prairie provinces. Ukrainians reacted by endeavoring to secure bilingual teachers from Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and by funding private schools of their own. The Alberta government effectively put a halt to attempts at bilingual instruction by barring teachers who did not possess the qualifications outlined by the Alberta Department of Education (Ibid.: 146-147). Political lobbying on the part of English-speaking sectors of the population, reflected in provincial newspapers in the Prairies, resulted in the abolition of bilingual schools in 1916 (Marunchak 1968: 152-153).

The action was greeted with anger and dismay among all the ethnic groups it affected. Ukrainians felt the abolition keenly, and redoubled their efforts to secure Ukrainian language instruction after school hours in privately-held Ukrainian schools. Special residential colleges called "bursas" were established to provide board and room for students of Ukrainian origin attending highschools and colleges in an effort to expose them to as much Ukrainian influence as possible.

Ukrainian language newspapers had always served as sources of information for the early immigrants for whom aspects of Canadian life needed clarification and interpretation. One of the first secular newspapers founded by Ukrainians was by bilingual schoolteachers who stressed that Ukrainians would be better equipped to articulate their aspirations and to participate in decisions affecting their future if they had more education and access to information.

Although the withdrawal of governmental support of bilingual schools presented a considerable setback for the morale of the group (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1969: 84; Pohorecky and Royick 1969: 171), the construction of community halls and institutes was successful in attracting a large number of supporters who were determined to encourage higher education without sacrificing the cultural past that they had hoped would be preserved abroad. An exerpt from an appeal to recruit students for a bursa read as follows:

> Do you know that thousands of our children in Alberta are waiting for their own teachers? Have you heard that there are practically none of our children in high schools? Have you noticed how few are doctors, priests, lawyers and businessmen? Is it not a sad situation among our people in Canada? We are behind in education, very far behind other nationalities.
>
> It is not too late to rectify the matter--if every Ukrainian farmer or laborer sends at least one of his children to higher

> schools. This is the only solution for our people.
>
> It is not easy to send a child to school in town. One must consider that the child needs adequate board and lodgings at a reasonable price and even more important, that the child does not forget his parents, his country and his faith. In order to assist in this objective, the M. Hrushevsky Association is establishing a Ukrainian Institute in Edmonton this fall. . . .
>
> (in Trosky 1968: 66).

Notable Greek Orthodox-managed bursas were the Adam Kotsko bursa which was non-sectarian, the Petro Mohyla Institute (Saskatoon), the Michael Hrushevsky Institute (later called St. John's College) in Edmonton, and St. Andrews College in Winnipeg. In addition, a number of community and parish halls were built to house extra-curricular language teaching schools for children and to provide them with facilities for presenting concerts and plays in Ukrainian. Community halls also served as meeting halls and social centres for adults, and received wide support.

Religious Conflict Within The Group

Beginning with the first immigration, Ukrainians were faced with intra-ethnic difficulties as well. No priests had accompanied the Greek Catholic immigrants, although arrangements were underway by 1901 (Trosky 1968: 3). Ukrainians, primarily from Bukovina, who still adhered to Greek Orthodoxy in greater numbers, sought the services of Russian Orthodox priests who had established jurisdiction in North America. Because there was no Greek Catholic hierarchy in Canada, the Roman Catholic church assumed jurisdiction over Greek Catholic affairs.

At the first settlement in the Edna (Alberta) area, a Russian Orthodox priest by the name of Alexandroff, encouraged his followers to apply to the government for free land and a construction permit to erect a church. This was in 1897. The Roman Catholic Bishop Legal, who accom-

panied the Greek Catholic priest for the settlement, also promised to secure land and financial aid (Ibid.: 4). Without permission from the immigrants, however, Bishop Legal applied for the land to be vested in his diocese in 1898 (Ibid.). When the church was built in 1899, a Greek Catholic Mass was celebrated, although some members of the congregation felt that a Greek Orthodox Mass should be held as well. The question of which group was entitled to legal possession came before the Supreme Court of the Northwest Territories and the verdict was in favour of the Orthodox trustees who made the original claim to build the church. The decision was reversed by the Supreme Court of Canada two years later. The case was then taken to the Privy Council in London, England, and the church again returned to its original trustees (Trosky 1968: 4).

The Russian Orthodox Church was popular among the settlers because the ritual was similar to their own Greek Orthodox church, and the priests were subsidized by the Holy Synod in St. Petersburg, Russia. Consequently the fees that were exacted for religious services were minimal (Ibid.: 5).

The popularity of the Church resulted in the formation of a sect which called itself the Seraphim Church, after Bishop Seraphim who had arrived in Canada from the United States. It flourished for a time, but was challenged by the Independent Greek Church which was founded by dissatisfied Seraphim followers. This new church was partly based on Presbyterian religion as a result of (English) Presbyterian missionary work among Ukrainians (Ibid.: 6; Bozhyk 1930: 83).

The fortunes of the Greek Catholic church were also undergoing transformation. Roman Catholic leaders wished to curtail the activities

of Greek Catholics in Canada and assume responsibility for their parishes. A particularly contentious issue was the right of Greek Catholic clergy to marry, because the practice was unacceptable to local Roman Catholics who supported the idea of one Catholic church.

> The Irish in the United States and the French-Canadian hierarchy met with Pope Leo XIII to have him forbid the Greek Catholic or Uniate Rite and to bring all the priests who belonged to the latter into the organization of the Latin Church.
>
> As a result, the Pope issued a Bull which restricted the rights of the Greek Catholic Church abroad.
>
> (Flak 1970: 17)

Although the Bull was later rescinded, the Greek Catholic Church was under considerable pressure from Roman Catholics.

The respective religious factions each published their own newspapers or newsletters. The Canadian Farmer and Morning were both Ukrainian language papers that were Presbyterian-backed and supported the Independent Greek Church. A group of Ukrainian schoolteachers formed a publishing company of their own and produced Ukrainian Voice which was initially independent of any religious group and attacked all of them. It especially challenged the employment of non-Ukrainian priests and French Roman Catholic bishops in the Greek Catholic Church, as well as the "acquisition of Greek Catholic property by the Roman Catholic Church" (Trosky 1968: 9). The Ukrainian Catholic Bishop was criticized, and an editorial stated that "Bishop Budka might as well bring in priests of many nationalities and then the Greek Catholic Church in Canada would represent a genuine Babylon" (Ibid.: 9). The newspaper gradually emphasized Ukrainian Orthodoxy as the ancestral religion of Ukrainians, declaring that under one religion the Ukrainians would be united as they had been centuries before:

> . . . In Catholicism as in Russian Orthodoxy, Ukrainian patriotism is not compatible. The one and the other desire to make a Ukrainian a

> servile slave and not a patriot, not even a man, but only a blind tool of their own interests.
>
> (in Trosky 1968: 9)

The aims of the teachers were to do away with the fragmented identity of Ruthenian, Galician, or Austrian in favour of Ukrainian, and they used the name in their letterhead. Support for a national Ukrainian Orthodox church grew and the plans for its formation began in 1918, although the activities of the First World War curtailed its growth for a time. This period also coincided with the end of the first major phase of Ukrainian immigration to Canada.

Political Events in the Ukraine Prior to the Second Immigration

In the brief Russian Revolution of 1905 Tsar Nicholas II promised the peasants land reforms, establishing a limited constitutional regime in Russia. A Ukrainian bloc was elected as a result, and it appeared as if other restrictions upon Ukrainians would be lifted as well in the new movement towards equality and reform. The Imperial Academy of Sciences had gone so far as to conclude that Little Russian (Ukrainian) was an independent Slavic language (Martowych 1952: 34). Hopes for Ukrainian independence grew when Austria and Russia declared war on each other in their quest for expansion. At the outbreak of World War I, Galician Ukrainians sided with Austria, hoping that an Austrian victory would mean better conditions for them. A group of east Ukrainian emigres who moved to Galicia, also supported this action and claimed to represent Russian Ukraine.

Internal discontent in Russia itself culminated in another Revolution in 1917 whereupon Ukrainian nationalist forces there created a Ukrainian Central Council (Ukrainska Centralna Rada) demanding autonomy

from the provisional Russian government at Petrograd. There were disputes between Kiev and Petrograd concerning the extent of Ukrainian autonomy, and attempts to curtail the activities of the Rada were made.

The Rada refused to recognize the supremacy of the Bolsheviks who invaded the Ukraine, and set up a Ukrainian Soviet Republic at Kharkiv. The Ukrainian National Republic then declared itself officially independent, and enacted the first peace treaty of the First World War at Brest-Litovsk (Young 1931: 26) between the Central Powers--i.e. Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey. The agreement was concluded to gain assistance in expelling the Soviet Russians from the Ukraine, before they could succeed in negotiating a settlement with the Central Powers on their own and in the name of the Ukraine (Martowych 1952: 47). Germany, which sent its support, was later renounced by the Rada when Germans attempted to interfere in the business of the Ukraine by installing their own very conservative supporters as heads (Young 1931: 26). At the same time the Rada continued to try to reach an agreement with France and England for aid, but the latter two countries were uncertain of the consequences of recognizing an independent Ukraine (Martowych 1952: 46).

When Austria-Hungary collapsed in 1918, the western Ukraine established its own republic according to the principles of self-determination supported by the Allies. The Poles also took advantage of the simultaneous downfall of Austria-Hungary and Russia to set up their own republic at the same time. At Versailles they demanded that Poland should include all of Galicia, including predominantly Ukrainian east Galicia on the grounds that the Poles owned over one third of the land (Young 1931: 27).

In the meantime the two Ukrainian Republics had joined, and endeavoured to fight the Poles, the Soviet Russians, and the White Russians under Denikin (who hoped to reinstate the former pre-revolutionary Russian regime) (Martowych 1952: 55). Denikin's forces were defeated, by the Soviets but the Ukrainians in turn formed an alliance with the Poles to secure their support against Russia. In the treaty, the Poles acknowledged the independence of the Ukrainian republic. Russia, however, defeated both, and the two powers of Russia and Poland partitioned the Ukraine, completely ignoring the terms of the Ukraine's treaty with Poland (Ibid.: 59). Russia received the largest portion of territory involving 32,000,000 Ukrainians while Poland assumed authority over 7,000,000 (Yuzyk 1953: 18). Czechoslovakia and Rumania also received lands in Carpathia and Bukovina which they seized when Austria-Hungary fell to set up their own governments.

The Effects on Canadian-Ukrainians

Ukrainians in Canada were not entirely unaffected during the First World War. Many ideologically supported the creation of an independent Ukraine and formed organizations to assist the Canadian government (Marunchak 1968: 343; Yastremskij 1943: 112) with the understanding that they would fight for the Ukraine when the time came (Pohorecky and Royick 1969: 171-172). The number of Ukrainians in Canada who began to list their ethnic origin as Ukrainian began to climb significantly during this period (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1961: 26). Unfortunately as Yastremskyj suggests, organizers who travelled to Ukrainian communities to promote support for the liberation of the Ukraine in conjunction with Canada's war effort were often identified

as representatives of one or the other rival Ukrainian religious groups and their proposals were categorically rejected as a matter of religious, rather than political principle (1943: 112). English-speaking Canadians who were unaware of the animosity between Greek Catholics and Greek Orthodox Ukrainians suspected that lack of support for Canada's involvement meant that Ukrainians were subversives on the side of Austria. Indeed, the citizenship of many was given as such prior to naturalization. Frequently, Canadian-Ukrainians were non-commital as a result of the fact that they did not wish to be involved in a battle with their own countrymen when the Ukraine sought the aid of the Central Powers.

Fear about the political orientation of Ukrainians in Canada led to the passage of the War Time Elections Act in 1917 which suspended their naturalization privileges; Ukrainian language newspaper publication was halted, churches and homes were raided, some were dismissed from work or interned, and their right to vote was taken away (Young 1931: 243; Palmer 1972: 79). Germans and members of other groups whose mother countries were engaged on the side of the Central Powers encountered similar treatment. The episode resulted in much resentment as Ukrainians sent delegations to Ottawa to protest their innocence. A Ukrainian Canadian Citizenship Committee was formed to co-ordinate Ukrainian-Canadian efforts to aid the Allies in the war, resulting in associations such as the Ukrainian Red Cross Society in Canada, and substantial contributions to the Patriotic Fund.

The Second Wave of Immigrants

Large scale Canadian immigration began shortly after the First World War ended, and lasted from 1923 until the Depression in 1931.

Canadian immigration was restricted to citizens from certain countries only, and Ukrainians at this time were classified as "non-preferred." The policy was designed to promote immigration from the British Islea and northern Europe in an effort to secure those who were literate, healthy, and had assurance of finding employment (Yuzyk 1953: 56).

Therefore, slightly less than one and a half thousand Ukrainians arrived between 1915 and 1925, to be followed by approximately 57,904 between 1926 and 1930 (Pohorecky and Royick 1969: 156), largely from the western Ukraine. The Eastern Ukraine had since been established as an official Soviet Republic under the control of Moscow.

The following table illustrates the distribution of the second major wave of Ukrainian immigrants.

Reasons prompting the second immigration were more political, and attributable to the downfall of the short-lived Ukrainian state. The immigrants were extremely nationalistic and literate compared to the peasants of the first migration.

> The rise and fall of the independent Ukrainian State (1917-1921) had developed in them a deep national consciousness; they were well versed in the historical past of their country. Nor were they confused as to their identity, a state of mind not shared by earlier immigrants. They were inclined to urban living, and only a small number settled permanently on farms. Many looked on agricultural work as a temporary occupation for the transitional period until jobs in the city were available. Others, as soon as some capital had been accumulated, opened their own business establishments.
>
> (Woycenko 1967: 13)

Contributions of the Second Wave of Immigrants

One of the important results of Ukrainian immigration was the establishment of strong Ukrainian organizations which were both nationalistic and religious, reflecting the "political alignments which emerged

TABLE 2

UKRAINIAN IMMIGRATION TO CANADA FROM 1952-1946

Wave 2a		Wave 2b	
1925	2,289	1936	815
1926	9,534	1937	1,215
1927	10,899	1938	1,905
1928	16,080	1939	1,776
1929	11,009		
1930	8,133		
Slump		Drop	
1931	541	1940	23
1932	482	1941	18
1933	380	1942	15
1934	578	1943	29
1935	483	1944	26
		1945	33
		1946	171

(Darcovich in Pohorecky and Royick 1969: 155)

during the short existence of the Ukrainian state or the powerful religious movements" (Yuzyk 1953: 81). Many attained prominent positions as spokesmen for the Ukrainian community, becoming editors of Ukrainian language newspapers (Palmer 1972: 81) and leaders of organizations. Proud of the achievements they had made in the Ukraine, and secure in their identity as Ukrainians, they revitalized the Ukrainian community in Canada by their vigourous defense of Ukrainian values and customs.

The dominant concerns of Ukrainian organizations at that time

reflected old country alignments: Catholicism, Orthodoxy, Republicanism, Nationalism, Communism, and Monarchism (Yuzyk 1953: 81). Catholic and Orthodox organizations were similar, and were designed to meet the cultural and religious needs of each community. The Ukrainian Self-Reliance League, however, worked in conjunction with the Orthodox Church and supported the cause for a Republican Ukraine in Europe (Ibid.: 84).

The Ukrainian National Federation (UNF) was founded in response to secular demands calling for an end to Ukrainian religious factionalism in order to work for the common goal of "winning liberty and statehood" for the Ukraine (Ibid.: 85). The Federation established Ukrainian libraries and schools throughout their meeting halls, as well as consumers' co-operatives, folk-dancing troupes, and choirs. Satellite organizations of the UNF were the Ukrainian War Veterans Association, Ukrainian Women's Organization, Ukrainian National Youth, and the Ukrainian National Association which is a fraternal insurance society.

The historical roots of the group of Ukrainians who were to become instrumental in forming communist organizations in Canada can be traced to Galicia in 1896, when the Ukrainian Social Democratic Party was created under the influence of social democracy during the Austro-Hungarian Empire (Yuzyk 1953: 97). Among the immigrants who came in the early 1900's were Social Democrats who formed their organization in 1907 in Canada. The success of the Bolshevik Revolution was championed as a victory of the proletariat and the Central Rada in the Ukraine was described as a bourgeois tool of international capitalism. Ukrainian Labour Temples were erected to serve as meeting halls and cultural educational societies. Later, when the Depression years resulted in the growth of radical agrarian reform movements in the West, the name was

changed to the Ukrainian Labour Farmer Temple Association to include the farmers who were perceived as an oppressed class also. In 1940, the Labour Temples were closed down by the Canadian government on account of their open advocacy of Communism. The members then reorganized and formed more culturally-oriented branches under the new name, Association of United Ukrainian Canadians. The organization continues to be active today and its pro-communist sympathies make it a target of Ukrainian nationalist animosities.

Monarchists were those who supported the hetmanite state set up by Skoropadsky (for the Germans) in 1918, and had the support of the Greek Catholic Church for a short time.

Although many Ukrainian nationalists deplored the religious factionalism and unnecessary duplication of Catholic and Orthodox organizations, their arrival nevertheless contributed greatly to the entrenchment of the Orthodox Church which identified itself as a nationalist church. By 1918 it became important to secure a Ukrainian bishop who had the authority to ordain priests:

> The existence of a Ukrainian bishop would have deep emotional connotation because the Ukraine from where the bishop was to come, had just recently established a state of its own and had restored the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church.
>
> (Trosky 1968: 22)

Of critical importance, however, was whether or not the bishop who was eventually invited from the Ukraine was canonical or not himself, for Metropolitan Lypkivsky, head of the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church in Kiev, had been elected by the Alexandrian method of ordination, by priests, rather than by two bishops as was customary (Ibid.: 23). There were questions therefore, about his authenticity, and allegations

were made that the Orthodox Church was full of "ignoramuses" and "quacks" (Ibid.: 27).

When the Greek Catholic Church printed defamatory articles against the Greek Orthodox Church in its press, it was brought to trial on one occasion and fined ten thousand dollars; subsequent libellious articles were retracted when prosecution was threatened. The Orthodox Church grew in popularity and was incorporated in 1929 as the Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church of Canada. Its membership continued to grow, largely at the expense of the Greek Catholic Church, which was perceived as more Catholic than Ukrainian.

The Third Wave of Immigrants

The third major wave of Ukrainian immigrants began at the outbreak of the Second World War, and grew to large numbers until a few years after the War ended. The following table indicates the trends:

TABLE 3

UKRAINIAN IMMIGRATION TO CANADA FROM 1947-1965

Wave 3				Decline	
1947	2,081	1953	957	1960	349
1948	10,041	1954	724	1961	165
1949	6,602	1955	560	1962	170
1950	3,815	1956	578	1963	215
1951	6,949	1957	530	1964	202
1952	2,859	1958	405	1965	283
		1959	346		

(Darcovich in Pohorecky and Royick 1969: 155)

Again, political events in Europe motivated many to leave. Ukrainians who remained after the partitions of the First World War were generally badly treated despite promises to guarantee cultural rights and self-government (Yuzyk 1953: 18). Rumania and Poland effectively suppressed Ukrainian nationalism and Poland received only a verbal reprimand for repudiating the Minorities Treaty at the League of Nations in 1934 (Ibid.: 19).

As an integral part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Ukrainians were forced to acknowledge Moscow's Five Year Plan to construct a socialist-type economy. Since collectivization was involved, many peasants resisted attempts to take control of their land. To break their recalcitrance, grain was forcibly collected, creating an artificial famine in which over five million Ukrainians perished (Martowych 1952: 65). At the height of the famine, the Ukraine was declared out of bounds to foreign news correspondents (Kostiuk 1960: 16). Purges against dissident intellectuals were initiated, and the "entire Ukrainian Orthodox hierarchy was, moreover, either executed or banished to Siberia and the church was ordered to dissolve" (Martowych 1952: 75).

In spite of the repressive nature of Polish rule, Ukrainians had a vigorous cultural life and succeeded in establishing a university in Lviv which lasted from 1921-1925. Unfortunately, further hopes to gain self-rule and autonomy sank when Galicia and Volynia were absorbed by the Soviet Union according to the terms of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact in a move made by Russia and Germany against Poland.

Ukrainians under Czech rule, however, were granted more freedom. The territory occupied by Ukrainians was then known as Sub-Carpathian Ruthenia. An earlier pledge to grant autonomy by 1919 was finally

carried out when Carpatho-Ukraine was granted autonomy in 1938, and became the target of hopes for the formation of a new independent Ukrainian state. When Prague fell to the Germans in 1939, Germany, who had reached an agreement with Russia, granted Hungarian troops a free hand, and they captured the capital of Hust in Carpatho-Ukraine, thereby driving all Ukrainian nationalist activity underground.

When Germany declared war on Russia, Ukrainians saw an opportunity to greet Germans as liberators from Stalinist rule. A group of underground nationalists seized Lviv from the Soviets and proclaimed the independence of Ukraine in 1941. To avoid the repetition of German-Ukrainian incidents which happened in 1918 and 1939 when independence was announced, the following Resolution was passed:

> The Ukrainian liberation efforts are completely and basically sincere and independent of any given combination of powers on the international scene. Under no circumstances will Ukrainian nationalism enter upon any compromise with the occupants of Ukrainian territories. It does, however, see possibilities of co-operation, but only with those nations which respect the ideal of Ukrainian statehood and sovereignty.
>
> (in Martowych 1952: 95)

Reaction from Germany was immediate and members of the new Ukrainian government were arrested and placed in concentration camps.

It was to escape from all of these circumstances that many Ukrainians came to Canada following the Second World War.

Impact of the Third Wave of Immigrants

The effect of the new war was felt by Ukrainian-Canadians as well. The most important result was the formation of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee to aid in Canada's war effort and avoid the unpleasant experiences and questions of loyalty that were problems during the

First World War. The Federal government, which was desirous of securing the support of Ukrainians during the war, aided in the consolidation of Catholic and Orthodox forces. In February 1940,

> the Ukrainian National Federation and the Ukrainian Catholic Brotherhood came together, with Professor Watson Kirkconnell as intermediary, and formed the Representative Committee of Ukrainian Canadians. Then, in May, three groups--the Ukrainian Self-Reliance League, the United Hetman Organization, and the League of Ukrainian Organizations, now Ukrainian Workers' League--united in the Central Representative Ukrainian Committee of Canada, with Professor G. W. Simpson as adviser. When the two committees failed to unite, the Canadian government sent its European adviser, Tracy Philipps, to Winnipeg and, with the aid of the other advisers, he finally negotiated co-ordination of the five organizations in October 1940. . . .
>
> At the time of its inception, the Ukrainian Canadian Committee could claim to represent well over 90 per cent of the Ukrainians in Canada. The support of the two churches, the Greek Catholic and the Greek Orthodox, alone meant the backing of 656 parishes, 149 priests, and 279,358 Ukrainians--91.3 per cent of the Ukrainian population. The five component organizations together with the two major churches comprised 1,429 organized units possessing 960 buildings. They published 6 weekly newspapers and 6 monthly papers.
>
> (Yuzyk 1953: 90)

The goal of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee was also to disseminate information about the Ukrainian situation in Europe, and to aid Ukrainian refugees.

Ukrainians of the third immigration were predominantly urban and well-educated compared to the two previous groups. In addition, they were drawn from the displaced persons camps in Europe where they awaited resettlement or repatriation (Kaye 1966: 42). "The refugee immigrant was deprived of the reassuring feeling that if conditions were not to his liking, he would be free to return to his country of origin" (Ibid.). As the prospects for achieving an independent Ukraine would be more remote than ever under the return of Soviet rule, many immigrants undoubtedly believed that it was their duty to exert considerable effort

to ensure that the Ukrainian heritage would survive. Many were attracted to the Ukrainian National Federation organization, but also formed their own organizations such as the Ukrainian Youth Association (Soyuz Ukrayinskoyi Molodi) and a Ukrainian Scouts' organization. The Ukrainian Canadian Committee were perceived as less nationalist in many cases, although this view was later changed.

The special role of the numerous academics who emigrated in the post-war period cannot be overlooked. Many sought and gained admission to Canadian universities where they established Departments of Slavic Studies for the purpose of teaching Ukrainian literature, some history and language. A generally hard-line emphasis on purging the Ukrainian language of anglicisms, that had crept in as part of the natural process of language change, was interpreted as an attack by Canadian-Ukrainians who were made to feel that they had somehow betrayed the Ukrainian "cause." From the standpoint of the immigrants, however, this position was tenable, in view of the insecurity and threat they felt as persons with no homeland from which they could draw support.

The formation of the Ukrainian Canadian Committee, which promoted the co-operation of first and second generation Ukrainians, provided a measure of support for the new immigrants who were also concerned with conditions in the Ukraine and the preservation of the language and culture abroad. The unification of Canadian-Ukrainians prior to the arrival of the new immigrants was an important step which made the concerns of the newcomers easier to implement. Although there was a Ukrainian-Canadian movement to establish Departments of Slavic Studies (Pohorecky and Royick 1969: 180) and in other ways increase the prestige and viability of the Ukrainian language and culture, the new immigrants

strengthened the movement and injected an additional feeling of pride and nationalism which benefitted the morale of existent organizations.

Presently, Ukrainians are recognized as one of Canada's strongest minority groups, inasmuch as their organizations press for greater acceptance and nation-wide implementation of multi-culturalism, cultural pluralism, and the concept of "unity in diversity." Although a significant number of spokesmen are articulate first generation immigrants who arrived after the Second World War, a disproportionate number (in terms of other ethnic groups) are also second and even third generation Ukrainians from each of the two previous immigrations (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1969: 110), who are more politically experienced in securing their goals in a Canadian situation.

Notable successes that have been achieved by the co-operation of various Ukrainian groups through the Committee have been the erection of a statue of Shevchenko, the Ukraine's national bard, on the Manitoba Legislative grounds; establishment of the million-dollar Shevchenko Research Foundation to encourage studies into the language and culture; translation of Shevchenko's works into English; and construction of Ukrainian Cultural Centres to house various functions of the Ukrainian community. Most important, perhaps, have been the successful efforts to have Ukrainian recognized as a language of instruction in schools, equal in status to French, German or Latin, and the presentation and consideration of briefs and documents outlining of Ukrainian position on bilingualism and biculturalism to the various levels of Canadian government. Recent trends have been to implement Ukrainian kindergarten classes in public schools and begin serious instruction in the Ukrainian language and culture in the first grade. Increased enrollments in Slavic Studies

Departments have brought into focus the possibility of Ph.D. programs in Ukrainian studies and training of potential Ukrainian teachers who are specialists in their field (Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club of Edmonton 1972: 11).

Undoubtedly, the strongest force motivating Ukrainians to maintain a high level of interest in preserving their ethnic identity has been a history of oppression and occupation by foreign powers in Europe. As current Soviet policy and communism are unpopular in North America, Ukrainians have achieved some measure of sympathy and understanding in their criticism of the USSR, and, by the same token, their commitment to their ethnic group. The Soviet invasions of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, coupled with recent expulsion or internments of dissident intellectuals have been brought to public attention by the English press as never before. The resultant public outcry and support of demonstrations and hunger strikes in sympathy with anti-Soviet sentiment, has provided added encouragement and solidarity to the ethnic groups involved, notably among younger members who find they can contribute effectively to this means of ethnic self-expression. In conclusion, it is safe to say that current trends indicate that a large proportion of Ukrainians continue to take to heart and repeat Governor-General Tweedsmuir's 1936 directive: "You will all be better Canadians for being also good Ukrainians" (in Prokop 1970: 25).

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL APPROACH

This chapter addresses itself to a discussion of ethnic identity in terms of selected models which have been commonly employed by various researchers to describe ethnic groups.

A traditional approach has been to emphasize the distinctness of one ethnic group over another on the basis of the same shared "culture" that constituted the fundamental requirement for group identity. In spite of the fact that it was often unclear as to the kind of criteria that were to be used as referents (Moerman 1965: 1215; Barth 1969: 9), similarities of language, territorial contiguity, distribution of institutions, etc., were viewed as parts of a great integrated whole that was maintained because individuals in that society shared a "uniform nuclear character" (Wallace 1961: 26). But Moerman, for example, drew attention to the problem of describing ethnic identity accurately on this basis. The Lue people whom he studied showed as much apparent speech divergence between different districts as between varieties of Lue and non-Lue dialects; trait distributions were discontinuous and out of correspondence with named tribes; moreover, various criteria delineated different ethnic units which did not coincide with self-identification (1965: 1217-1219). In a partial response to this difficulty, Moerman suggested that it would be more fruitful to examine critical cues peculiar to the native's own way of conceptualizing his identity, which were not necessarily congruent with the objective criteria employed by the researcher

(Ibid.: 1228).

The same limitations inherent in the application of purely objective criteria to the Lue, apply also to current studies of immigrant ethnic groups in North America. The "viability" of an ethnic group often depends on its members being able to satisfy several requirements stipulated by the researcher, however partially they may account for the variation. To illustrate the inadequacy of this approach to ethnic studies, Gordon's Table of Assimilation Variables will be discussed:

TABLE 4

THE ASSIMILATION VARIABLES

Subprocess or Condition	Type or Stage of Assimilation	Special Term[1]
Change of cultural patterns to those of host society	Cultural or behavioral assimilation	Acculturation
Large-scale entrance into cliques, clubs, and institutions of host society, on primary group level	Structural assimilation	None
Large-scale intermarriage	Marital assimilation	Amalgamation
Development of sense of peoplehood based exclusively on host society	Identificational assimilation	None
Absence of prejudice	Attitude receptional assimilation	None
Absence of discrimination	Behavior receptional assimilation	None
Absence of value and power conflict	Civic assimilation	None

The Assimilation Model

Although Gordon is by no means the chief proponent of this type of study, his framework is selected as an example, since many current

[1]This table appears exactly as is in Gordon, 1964: 71, and the designation "special term" is his own.

studies on ethnic identity base their theoretical approach upon his findings (for example Lai 1971; Elliott 1971; Porter 1973). The list of assimilation variables rests upon Gordon's own compilation and integration of concepts and data from earlier, often intuitive work on ethnicity. For example it was argued that much similarity and common ways of thought and action were necessary before amalgamation, or successful mixed marriages, could occur (Woolston 1965: 261), hence the assumption, that amalgamation will follow structural assimilation.

Central to the theoretical approach of Gordon's model is the concept of assimilation into the "host society," which is the group that "provides the standard to which other groups adjust or measure their relative degree of adjustment" (1964: 72). It is postulated that all ethnic groups will eventually become similar over time, and approximate the lifestyle of the long-established, white, Protestant, Anglo-Saxon middle class (Ibid.). The actual process of assimilation may be achieved by means of several stages. Gordon stresses that "Once structural assimilation has occurred, either simultaneously with or subsequent to acculturation, all of the other types of assimilation will naturally follow" (Ibid.: 81). Initially, the terms of the mandate of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism supported the assimilationist viewpoint as well by suggesting that emphasis should be placed on developing Canadian society in line with the cultures of the "two founding races" or "charter groups"--the British and the French.

In his review of the acculturation model (which resembles the assimilation model in many respects) Hedley has drawn attention to the fact that the inherent dualism of such models lies at the heart of their limitations and invites tautological reasoning (1971: 4). The immi-

grant and his offspring are perceived as being "caught between two cultures" (Ibid.). However, because each "culture" is defined at the outset as being quite distinct (as per Gordon's definition of the host society described on the previous page), the argument that is usually made is that unassimilated groups exist because they are outside of the host society, and, because they are unlike the host society they are unassimilated (Ibid.: 66)! In discussing the Canadian situation in terms of a model similar to Gordon's, Porter's conclusions lead to a similar cul-de-sac (1973: 62-64) where immigrants are concerned. Moerman's work (1965) in relation to the inaccuracy of perceiving "cultures" as being homogeneous units has already been discussed at the beginning of the chapter. More serious, however, is the built-in assumption that the culture of the "host society" represents a model or an ideal which the immigrant group chooses to replicate.

In the Prairie Provinces where nearly one half of the population is not of Anglo-Saxon origin and ethnic groups are heavily concentrated in certain regions, there are few indications to show that the Ukrainian group has opted for assimilating into the host society. Especially noteworthy is the fact that the group's history in Canada now exceeds seventy-five years, and Ukrainians continue to be singled out as a vocal minority where the preservation of their heritage is concerned. If anything, the numerous letters of protest directed at the Royal Commission's limited definition of bilingualism and biculturalism in terms of French/English bilingualism and biculturalism, serve as excellent illustrations of the strong attraction for a multicultural framework instead.[2]

---

[2]During the course of my work as a research assistant for Dr. J. B. Rudnyckyj, a member of the Royal Commission, in 1970, the volume of briefs presented by the Ukrainian group was extremely large.

The more recent studies on numerous "other ethnic groups" have also begun to question the chronologically deterministic order of the stages by which assimilation is believed to occur. Residential desegregation of immigrant groups was formerly thought to have been an indicator of increasing socio-economic and cultural similarity to the host society. Lai (1971) uses residential segregation as one of the indeces of structural assimilation which Gordon stresses is the key to other types of assimilation (1964: 81). However, studies by Darroch and Marston conducted on the populations of large Canadian cities have shown that this is not true. According to their investigation, education, occupation, and income differences "could account for less than half of the actual residential segregation between the origin groups, and in most cases much less than half" (1972: 507). Even among ethnic groups more or less similar in socio-economic position, residential segregation remained high, and was not affected by differences based on the times of arrival of the ethnic population (Ibid.).

Few ethnic groups can be so neatly plugged into the rigid framework of the assimilation model, with the result that the nature of ethnic identity is illuminated very little. A case in point is Lai's conclusions concerning Chinese ethnic identity. The Chinese are

> . . . only partially culturally assimilated, partially structurally assimilated and although a significant proportion have a strong civic identificational assimilation they tend to be insistent with respect to the preservation of their language and overall cultural identity.
>
> (1971: 138)

As Darroch and Marston have also pointed out, it is indeed unfortunate that differences in ethnic expression have been so uncritically used to confirm the direct appeal or "pull" of the host society as if it were a

cause-effect relationship (1972: 495).

The Organization of Diversity Approach

As the preceding example has shown, there is difficulty in accounting for the variability that occurs in ethnic groups. Cultures are not homogeneous, and change does not occur in the orderly manner that has been predicted. Traditional research has tended to emphasize that cognitive sharing[3] was a necessary functional prerequisite for successful interaction in society. It has only been comparatively recently that an alternative philosophy or school of thought has been advanced. The latter school of thought stresses that variability is the key to understanding human relationships, and was developed by Wallace (1961) who showed that the investigator of "X" phenomenon in any society must understand the "cognitive maps"[4] of the individuals he is studying. This is no mean task, for the cognitive maps are unique, and the perception of the structure of any one map is influenced differently by the researcher's own. By using a "secondary equivalence structure" to describe the simplest socio-cultural interaction, where a^1 and b^1 are instrumental acts and a^2 and b^2 are consummatory acts, Wallace has demonstrated that at least four cognitive maps in addition to the researcher's own are capable of arriving at the same conclusion (Ibid.: 35), or producing

---

[3] Cognitive sharing refers to the shared goals and perceptions among individuals which would result in a uniform nuclear character.

[4] Cognitive maps are defined as positive and negative goals of self and others, material objects, and of their possible dynamic interrelations in process, which an individual maintains at a given time (Wallace 1961: 15-16).

the same end result or behavior.

In terms of ethnic group studies, Wallace's approach suggests that there are diverse ways of showing one's commitment to an ethnic group, and that the means by which this is done will vary. In short, different motivations can appear to produce similar results, and may be wrongly interpreted by a researcher. Wallace's model may provide the key to understanding those situations that arise from reliance on the assimilation model, and which can only partially account for ethnic identity, or where "civic identificational assimilation" occurs in conjunction with insistence on cultural survival (as per Lai 1971) but cannot be explained. Wallace's approach has been referred to as the "organization of diversity" approach, in contrast to the "replication of uniformity" concept emphasized in models which stress the homogeneity of a culture and view variability as a sign of disintegration.

Organization of Diversity and Ethnic Studies

An early attempt to develop an organization of diversity approach to understanding ethnic identity was made by Hansen who formulated the idea of third generation return (1952: 495). Hansen believed that the second generation in an ethnic group endeavours to rid itself of numerous vestiges of ethnicity, while the third generation actually seeks to preserve the ethnic heritage. Hansen's theory was based on his own research during the course of collecting material for the history of American immigration, as well as on "the almost universal phenomenon that what the son wishes to forget the grandson wishes to remember" (Ibid.). Although Hansen's analysis was originally directed at Swedish immigrants, others soon recognized it as a useful conceptual tool and explored the

process in greater detail (see Bender and Kagiwada 1968 for a short critique of such studies), clarifying the mechanisms involved in the shift from second to third generation identity.

Nahirny and Fishman (1966) have also used a modified form of Hansen's original formulation to describe Ukrainian ethnic identity (in the United States) as a function of generational variability characterized by a different mode of orientation for each generation. Different political philosophies and histories, however, have made the adjustment of Canadian and American ethnic groups dissimilar, hence several important qualifications to the Nahirny/Fishman framework are necessary. The following table summarizes the variability in ethnic response within each generation, and is reproduced from Nahirny and Fishman 1966: 351. It represents the basic framework that will be used to describe Ukrainian-Canadian ethnic identity in this study, and a critique of the model follows.

There is essentially no quarrel with the concept of "primordial ethnicity," for it is generally agreed that immigrants who have internalized the values of their own culture usually continue to maintain many connections with their past. Ethnicity is primordial in the sense that it involves attempts to approximate the original lifestyle as much as circumstances will permit. For example, Nahirny and Fishman point out that

> . . . sheer human sentiment was involved in the establishment of many immigrant organizations and their primary function . . . was to foster the friendly ties among former neighbours and, thereby, to keep alive the local customs and precious personal memories of their ancestral homes.
>
> (1966: 346)

TABLE 5

GENERATIONAL DIFFERENCES IN ORIENTATION TOWARD ETHNICITY

Generations:	First (Grandfather)	Second (Son)	Third (Grandson)
Type of Identification	Primordial	Symbolic	Functional
Mode of Orientation	Personal Affective	Symbolic Affective	Cognitive Appreciative
Object of Orientation	Tradition (Ancestral Past)	Ideology (Transmuted Past)	History (Historical Past

(Nahirny and Fishman 1966: 351)

In the case of Ukrainians, the ancestral past was held up as a special object of glorification since political events in Europe thwarted the realization of nationalist goals many times. Consequently, an even greater burden was placed upon the immigrant to preserve his culture abroad. The earliest wave of immigrants perceived the establishment of the Greek Catholic church as vital in Canada, since under the fairly tolerant Austro-Hungarian Empire it was a symbol of the cultural differences between themselves and the Poles with whom they shared Galicia.

Since language barriers normally prevented immigrants from much contact with others, their folk customs, food preferences, etc. continued as relatively unchanged and integral parts of daily life. There was an emotional link with the Ukraine, with frequent and direct comparisons between the familiar and comfortable aspects of living in the old country, and the strange customs and hardships in the new land. The mode of orientation was therefore personal and affective.

For the second generation, it was difficult to sustain the same

kind of commitment, largely because of the difficulty of communicating many aspects of primordial ethnicity out of their original context. Contact with the ethnic heritage in its authentic (primordial) sense was secondarily experienced through the memories of their parents, and, by definition, more transmuted. Many traditions and practices ceased to have meaning and were dropped from the individual's repertoire.

> Since dentists, for example, cured toothaches in this country, St. Appolonia could not but lose her clients; since geese and pigs were out of sight in urban centers or even in mining towns, their protectors, St. Martin and St. Thomas could not but be doomed to chronic unemployment. Not only such cases of peasant superstition but also many other ethnic-religious customs and traditions became irrelevant . . . For what could their American-born children derive from such a New Year's greeting as "May God bless you with a good crop of rye, wheat, and everything good."
>
> (Nahirny and Fishman 1966: 330-331)

Ukrainian identity became "symbolic identity," viewed "as the dead hand of the past" which they "were taught to hold dear and respect in their childhood years" (Ibid.: 347), largely in appreciation and recognition of the many hardships and sacrifices their parents had to suffer in attempting to recreate a new life.

> By listening to stories told by parents or by studying ethnically oriented geography and history, the sons were able at best to conceive of the old country as possessing some generalized attributes--be they Norwegian fjords and folk customs or Ukrainian orchards and folkdances.
>
> (Ibid.: 347)

Since many day-to-day aspects of ethnicity practised by their parents were meaningless, the generalized, broader issues of being Ukrainian which transcended the immediate reality received greater elaboration. Whereas Ukrainians shortly after immigration may have been poor, illiterate, and ridiculed, the poetry of Shevchenko or the exploits of the Cossacks evoked pride in being Ukrainian and resulted in a sym-

bolic link with the past. Ukrainian national values and aspirations that compared favourably with those of other ethnic groups were easier to comprehend and identify with. It is in the area of second generation orientation that Nahirny and Fishman depart from Hansen's overly-general description of second generation identity as one plagued by

> . . . criticisms and taunts of the native Americans and the criticisms and taunts of their elders as well . . . They were not slow in comprehending the source of all their woes: it lay in the strange dualism into which they had been born. . . . He wanted to be away from all physical reminders of early days, in an environment so different, so American, that all associates naturally assumed that he was as American as they.
>
> (1966: 494)

However, impressive Ukrainian support for multiculturalism calls into question Hansen's outright rejection pattern, and suggests that the Nahirny and Fishman modification from primordial to symbolic ethnicity is more in order.

In so far as identification with the ethnic heritage is ideological, a feeling rather than a behavior, inter-action with non-Ukrainians is not incongruent with ethnic identity, and is, therefore, not an indication of assimilation or betrayal of the heritage.

For the third generation, ethnic identity is functional, i.e. it is redefined to a more purposive and direct, rather than ideological level. Nahirny and Fishman point out that the third generation has never experienced primordial ethnicity like its parents who had at least felt its effects secondarily. Consequently, the third generation endeavours to recreate and retrace the ethnic heritage, precisely because it has been unknown to them (1966: 343). The historical aspects of the Ukrainian culture receive much emphasis (the object of orientation is the historical past) at the expense of the ancestral past of the grandfathers

which is out of context for the Canadian-born. An ideological orientation to the Ukraine like the one held by the second generation is difficult to comprehend because tales of first generation hardship and sacrifice did not fill the ears of the third generation as they did for the second, with the result that the sentimental obligation to Ukrainian national values is more difficult to sustain. The Ukrainian national values expressed through the medium of literary Ukrainian are given less prominence than the more readily graspable traditions of Easter-egg painting or folk-dancing. Similarly, Bociurkiw notes that there was a narrow margin between Prince Vladimir the Great and Taras Bulba when Canadian-born Ukrainians were asked to name three important figures in Ukrainian history (1969: 22). (The former was in power during the period of cultural florescence in the Ukraine, while the latter was popularized in the cinema as a rough and tough Cossack easily identifiable with a number of current movie heroes of the same genre, and therefore easily remembered and understood).

Without the ideological commitment of the second generation, third generation identity is something to be preserved, appreciated, and justified on grounds that it fulfills a function--it adds a different dimension to the personality and fulfills a basic need for telling a person who he is.

The attempt to replicate aspects of largely material culture and study them in a serious way has been interpreted as the third generation "return" to ethnicity in Hansen's hypothesis (1952: 495), but only in relation to the assumed lack of interest that he posited for the second.

In the Nahirny and Fishman framework (1966), the third generation represents the final stage before ethnic identity loses its meaning.

The rationale given is that it becomes

> an object of cognition, in the sense that the grandsons had to study it in order to know about their ethnic heritage and to appreciate it. But such knowledge and appreciation of the ancestral past had little or no effect on their daily lives--from the selection of spouses to personal and organizational associations.
>
> (Ibid.: 351)

Treated like another school subject, ethnicity has little opportunity to become an important part of life.

It is in the area of third generation ethnicity, however, that the Nahirny and Fishman hypothesis (1966) falls short of presenting a completely accurate picture of identity. The problem of succeeding generations of different expressions of identity is the inevitable result of the inability to communicate primordial ethnicity (Ibid.: 346) out of its original context. As such, changes in ethnic identity are entirely understandable and normal, as each generation endeavours to come to terms with it in the only way open to them.

The third generation, however, is unique in being the first to justify ethnic identity in terms of its relevance to the Canadian situation, unlike the first and second generations whose commitment to the group was wholly or partially derived from a dependence on the Ukraine as an object of orientation. Consequently, third generation identity should not signal "the beginning of the end," but the rationale for a different kind of ethnic expression whose potential to continue is ensured by the fact that a niche for it has been found in Canadian society. Regardless of its mode of expression, third generation identity cannot be disparaged in a society claiming to be pluralistic. The genesis of the very important cognitive-appreciative mode of orientation (Ibid.: 351) cannot be overlooked, for it represents a justification for identity

on rational, rather than emotional (first generation) or sentimental ideological (second generation) grounds, and consequently is easier to defend and communicate. The powerful motivating force causing the third generation to seek out and study aspects of the ethnic heritage is evidence enough for the strong interest that must underlie this mode of orientation.

Neither are predictions about the nature of fourth generation response entirely out of order. Given the kind of plateau that is reached by the third generation, there is every reason to suppose that fourth generation ethnic identity will continue to reflect the same concerns and fulfill the same needs. To illustrate with an example, the maintenance of Doukhobor Russian identity in Canada has become a particular concern of fourth generation teenagers "who are involved in active efforts to revitalize the Russian language and Doukhobor culture" (Vanek and Darnell 1971: 7). It is interesting that Doukhobor Russians also identify Canadian-born second generation individuals in their community as language models, and not members of the first generation who, although they speak very well, are too "removed from the affairs of the community" (Ibid.: 15). This suggests the beginning of a shift in ethnic identification where Canadian-born Doukhobor Russians have been singled out as more meaningful models to emulate for younger members of the community who find it easier to relate to them.

In summary, ranges in patterns of ethnic identification among succeeding generations are not necessarily indicative of ethnic group dissolution as has been frequently supposed. Instead, they are entirely natural developments representing the different ways through which commitment to the ethnic group may be expressed. As such, variability within an ethnic group may be likened to an organization of diversity

(Wallace 1961: 28) where different experiences with ethnicity for each generation produce different cognitive maps (Ibid.: 16) or orientations for parent and child. The orientations towards ethnicity are summarized in Nahirny and Fishman's Generational Differences in Orientation Toward Ethnicity (Table 5), although the greater Canadian sensitivity to the issue of cultural pluralism suggests that the implications of third generation response are less pessimistic than those suggested by their research.

CHAPTER III

THE PARISH

In keeping with the numerous studies illustrating the close connection between the parish church and the maintenance of ethnic identity (Bociurkiw 1969; Millett 1971), a Ukrainian Orthodox parish in north Edmonton was selected as a focus of study in order to investigate modes of ethnic expression. In particular, the parish-sponsored, Saturday morning Ukrainian school was chosen as the primary area of concentration. Rationale for this choice was based on the important association that many Ukrainians have attached to language maintenance efforts and cultural viability throughout their history. Consequently, language attitudes of parents and children connected with extra-curricular language teaching efforts would prove instructive for ethnic identity. Since most children and parents were also members of the parish sponsoring the Saturday morning classes, they participated in other church-related ethnic organizations which also proved illuminating for the study of ethnic identity.

The Population

Total membership in the parish consisted of approximately 120 families, of which 70 to 100 were regular attenders.[1] Its comparatively small size made it possible to deal with members on a more personal basis. Nearly three fifths of the parishioners were beyond middle age

[1] Fr. Stus., pers. comm.

(past their fifties); however, twenty-two families comprising the more youthful members had enrolled thirty-one of their children, ranging in age from 6 to 15, in the Saturday morning school. The official enrollment at the school was 63, but ten pupils had either stopped attending after registration or came once a month. The remaining number of twenty-two pupils from eleven families were from mixed backgrounds or else subscribed to another faith. Although the latter sub-group was not analysed in terms of statistical data, it provided a useful contrast and will be discussed where applicable.

All told, forty-three adults (one parent was deceased) comprising twenty-two families and their thirty-one children provided the bulk of informants in the study.

The majority of adults (28, or 66% of the sample) were born in Canada and were, therefore, second generation Ukrainians. The other fifteen, or 34% were first generation Ukrainians who arrived shortly prior to or following the Second World War. First generation males (10) outnumbered first generation females two to one, but second generation females (17) outnumbered second generation males of whom there were only eleven. No third generation parents were involved in the parish sample.

On the basis of the very arbitrary Dominion Bureau of Statistics classification of children's ethnic membership according to the male parent's ancestry, and because other references follow the same scheme, second generation children were defined as those whose fathers were born in the Ukraine, regardless of mother's place of birth. The number of children falling into this category was 14, or 45%. The remaining 17 or 55% were third generation children.

In terms of socio-economic status, only three adults had some

university training or the equivalent, and were in teaching or the communications field. Few had completed high school, although half had some secondary education. Usually these were second generation adults. First generation respondents had a European education of four or five grades, while the remaining second generation respondents had a junior high school education. Although nearly all adults had lived in Edmonton for many years, many originally came from a rural background.

Methodology

A questionnaire composed of 98 items (see Appendix 1) was the basic methodological tool. Portions of it were questions from the language attitude survey in Vanek and Darnell's (1971) Doukhobor Russian Lexical and Dialectological Questionnaire and rephrased for use with Ukrainians. The format consisted of thirty-one opening questions designed to gather biographical data. Forty more questions, in many instances paralleling those in the Vanek and Darnell study (Ibid.) were related to native language attitudes as a means of obtaining information which could be related to the extent of "Canadianization" of Ukrainians in the survey. Since native language attitudes determine, at least in part, the nature of ethnic identity, they would be expected to be modified as changes in general ethnic orientation are made as well. Studies in Grand Forks, British Columbia, involving Russian Doukhobors indicate that their native language attitudes are changing. However,

> Such a process need not be seen solely as one of language loss. If the language is adapting to changed social conditions it is still very much alive. On the one hand, influences from outside the Doukhobor community are increasing in their intensity (for example through mass media, public education, wider economic influences, and geographical mobility). These factors mitigate against preservation

> of the Russian language. On the other hand, conscious efforts to maintain Russian in a context appropriate to Canada make it increasingly likely that young Doukhobors will move through a normal life cycle of language use in which speech roles and traditional materials become more available to them with age.
>
> (Vanek and Darnell 1971: x)

A parallel between language attitude change and overall attitudinal shifts in ethnic orientation can be drawn. In both cases, change is not necessarily indicative of the breakdown of ethnicity but an adaptation to make each relevant in a Canadian context.

The questions were also designed to (a) tap respondents' feelings with respect to continuing a Ukrainian language Mass or Liturgy in view of the English-speaking route that many ethnic churches have chosen by necessity; and (b) to test for areas of concern with respect to intermarriage, attitudes towards the Ukraine, participation in Ukrainian organizations, and compartmentalization of ethnic behavior into specialized areas of daily life (for example, to determine if Canadian-born Ukrainians use Ukrainian only to speak to relatives, at Christmas,[2] etc.). In each case, respondents were personally interviewed (most adults, chose to be telephoned) and encouraged to elaborate in their replies. It cannot be overemphasized that a questionnaire serves as a guide in outlining specific areas of inquiry; however, the "questionnaire which prevents the interviewer from pursuing an interesting tangent is a liability (Vanek and Darnell 1974: xiii).

Only two adults chose to be interviewed in Ukrainian because their command of English was poor. Rapport was very good, as respondents knew the interviewer to be of Ukrainian ancestry and experienced in both

---

[2] For a more detailed explanation of rationales for each question, see Appendix 2.

Ukrainian and Sunday school instruction.

CHAPTER IV

QUALITATIVE DATA

Although it would seem fairly obvious that persons of Ukrainian ancestry would list their ethnic origin as such, question 33 (see Appendix 1) became more interesting when individuals of mixed parentage were posed the question. Parishioners and their children listed their ethnic origin as Ukrainian, even in the case of one family where the father had married a woman of English background. Children from this family participated in Ukrainian and Sunday School activities, and seemed to equate being "Ukrainian" with being "different" from other non-Ukrainian families although they were not clear on why there was a difference. It was surprising that they should identify with the group that was a puzzle to them, rather than with their mother's group which probably would have been easier in view of the larger society.

Children of mixed marriages who were not members of the parish identified the Ukrainian parent first, but also the other parent's group as well. The stronger association, however, seemed to be with the Ukrainian group, as children did not participate very much in the Swedish, German, Polish, or "English" cultural activities that would parallel their involvement in Ukrainian ones, possibly because the (1) the interviewing context was a Ukrainian one to begin with; and (2) the cultural activities of Swedes, Germans and Poles in Edmonton are fewer compared to the Ukrainian group. In the case where one parent was of "English" origin, the Ukrainian heritage of the other seemed to be treated as

another dimension inasmuch as the Anglo-Saxon culture is the one taken for granted by the larger society. In the non-parish sample, the parent who was not of Ukrainian origin was most frequently the male, suggesting that the female had more influence. This matter will be taken up in conjunction with the role of the male parent in the parish sample.

There seemed to be a clear association in the parish sample with being of Ukrainian ancestry and an obligation to speak Ukrainian. Where respondents were of Ukrainian ancestry but did not speak the language well (question 34), they apparently felt it was necessary to explain why. For example, the reason given by one mother for her child's lack of knowledge was that she had to work and left the child with an English-speaking babysitter. She was currently trying to remedy the situation by sending the child to Ukrainian school. The apparent need to explain why one did not speak Ukrainian even though the question asked was "What is your ethnic origin?" suggests that individuals have been made conscious of the fact that the two have been traditionally associated with each other and are still expected to be. Replies to this question indicated that respondents were sensitive to the current emphasis being placed on maintaining the native language to the point where they felt they had to "apologize" for "neglecting" this aspect of their education. Children wished they had been able to speak better in order to communicate with their grandparents. Whatever the reasons, numerous respondents stated that the concern grew out of the controversies generated by the Royal Commission's (see Introduction) initial emphasis on only French and English linguistic and cultural rights.[1]

---

[1]Interview with J. M., owner of Ukrainian bookstore in Edmonton in 1974.

Participants in the study were asked to describe how frequently they used Ukrainian in the home. The results are summarized in Table 6:

TABLE 6

AMOUNT OF UKRAINIAN SPOKEN IN THE HOME AMONG MEMBERS OF THE SAME FAMILY

	Adults' Perceptions	Children's Perceptions
Number of families stating that Ukrainian was spoken more often than English	6	3
Number of families where Ukrainian was spoken more often than English but children replied to parents in English	0	3
Number of families where English was spoken more frequently than Ukrainian	16	16

Adults who used Ukrainian to the greatest extent were, by and large, first generation immigrants for whom English was definitely a second language. Although the children of first generation immigrants were functional bilinguals and understood what was being said to them because they heard the native language frequently enough, it was not clearly identified with day-to-day living. All children, with one exception, perhaps, stated that Ukrainian was the hardest language for them to learn, indicating that their fluency in it was not on a par with English. Fifty per cent of the children listed Ukrainian as their native language but qualified this further by stating that as far as they were concerned, they were still learning it. A number of them drew attention to the fact that their parents had once told them that they had been quite fluent as preschoolers, and that as they grew up, their knowledge of Ukrainian seemed to fall behind. One reason that was given as a possible explana-

tion was that they learned conversational Ukrainian (more useful in an informal setting), and that their parents did not know the Ukrainian equivalents to many everyday English words themselves, such that they grew up speaking anglicized Ukrainian as they became older. The latter explanation seems to have been borne out by observations in the parish. Parents who were second generation Ukrainians pointed out that it was more tempting and easier to lapse into English to speak to their children because they knew more English words. Only one third generation child said that Ukrainian was his native language.

Approximately fifty per cent of all adults and children believed that "old" people were the best speakers of Ukrainian. In this case, "old" was associated with persons well beyond middle age. In Vanek and Darnell's analysis of the Russian Doukhobor situation in British Columbia, the linguistic competence of the oldest generation of Russian-born Doukhobors was greatly valued as "a reminder of the traditions of Doukhoborism" (1971: 6). Similarly, children and adults in the north-side parish praised the linguistic competence of "old" people, regretting that much in the way of traditional Ukrainian culture was being lost.

Interestingly, another fifty per cent wished to qualify the statement that was asked, indicating that "old" people spoke Ukrainian less grammatically, and often inserted Polish or Russian expressions. While the latter point of view was expected from post World War II (first generation adults who were more literate and politically conscious) as well as from their second generation children, it was not expected from third generation children who were not fluent in the language themselves. It is not inconceivable that third generation attitudes on this issue are based on the emphasis that has been placed on speaking

Ukrainian "correctly" in Ukrainian school where the teachers are of first and second generation Ukrainian ancestry. Non-parish children also emphasized that it was important to speak Ukrainian properly.

Vanek and Darnell (1971) have commented upon a similar phenomenon among the Russian Doukhobor community as well. Young Doukhobor Russians also identified persons from the middle generation as excellent speakers (Ibid.: 15) for the language of the elderly retained numerous archaic forms of the language which were no longer relevant in a Canadian context (Ibid.: 9). The elderly were also removed from the everyday concerns of the Doukhobor Russian community. It seems apparent that the question regarding linguistic competence of elderly persons in the northside parish tapped two important issues at the same time: (1) that the elderly are admired and serve as reminders of the ancestral traditions, but (2) current ethnic identity is predicated on a distinct Ukrainian-Canadian base. This finding would also tend to confirm the Nahirny and Fishman conceptualization of "symbolic affective" ethnic identity where there is an acknowledgement of the traditions of the past that is, nevertheless, modified to suit the present situation. It does not represent a denial or betrayal of the ethnic heritage.

All adults in the study stated that they learned Ukrainian from their parents, compared to sixteen per cent of the children who stated that they learned the language from their grandparents and in Ukrainian school. Children who were not members of the parish also learned from their grandparents and Ukrainian school.

The fact that it was the third generation who replied most frequently in this manner lends support to the Nahirny and Fishman hypothesis regarding the nature of "cognitive-appreciative" ethnicity. Bilin-

gual second generation adults are capable of teaching their children Ukrainian, but the exigencies of daily life are such that it is simpler for the second generation to speak English. As a result, third generation children identify their grandparents as models of "authentic" or "primordial" ethnicity, and learn about the heritage from them. Inasmuch as their contact with their grandparents is of a different order than the relationship enjoyed by their own parents, the orientation towards the heritage is of a different order as well. Less familiar with first hand accounts of life in the Ukraine, and not as adept in the native language as their parents were, the orientation of the third generation is less emotional ("symbolic-affective"), and more curious and interested in gaining a general knowledge about their historical roots ("cognitive-appreciative").

Parents and children were asked what measures could be taken to encourage children to speak Ukrainian. Most felt that it was sufficient just to speak it at home. The comparatively small emphasis that was placed on the role of the Church and other institutions indicates that the issue of language maintenance is still felt to be primarily a family concern.

Nearly all adults and children felt that Ukrainian should be included in the curriculum in public schools. Rationales for why it was good to learn Ukrainian appear in Tables 7, 8, and 9.

The breakdown of responses by generations shows that first generation Ukrainians were more dogmatic about learning Ukrainian because it was their <u>own</u> language, hence the one most natural for "their" people. Second generation adults were more concerned with communicating with

TABLE 7

WHY IS IT GOOD TO LEARN UKRAINIAN
(First Generation Adults)

Because it is the language of the forefathers.
Because it is our language.
There are many Ukrainians in Edmonton.
If you are a Ukrainian, you should learn it!
It is good!
The government lets us, so why not?
There is no reason why we should not learn it.
You will be culturally poor if you know only one language.
It is good to know another language.
Because it is a good language.
It is your own language.
If you are Ukrainian you should learn it.
It didn't hurt me.
You should know your own language.
Don't know, but it is good.

TABLE 8

WHY IS IT GOOD TO LEARN UKRAINIAN?
(Second Generation Adults and Children)

Adults
It is good to learn another language.
If you learn one language then you can learn others easier.
It's just as good as any other language!
It's good even if you are Italian.

"TABIE 8-Continued."

If your parents speak it, you should try.

So you can speak with your grandparents.

It's good to talk with the relatives.

Because of the benefits of a second language.

It's good to speak another language,

All Ukrainians should learn it.

It's nice.

Yes, I am one and our people should stick up for themselves.

It is good to know your own language.

It's all right.

It's nice to know your own language.

You can talk with relatives.

You can speak with everyone.

You can speak with your grandparents.

The more you know, the better.

Edmonton is a Ukrainian settlement.

Many people here talk it.

Your parents and relatives talk it.

I worked in an old folks' home and the old ladies there were delighted (to hear me speak it).

It's just as good as some other languages!

You can talk with friends and relatives.

If you go to the Ukraine, it will help you understand.

A lot of people around here are Ukrainian.

It's good to speak another language.

"TABLE 8-Continued."

Children

You will know another language.

Good to talk to grandparents.

You'll understand people from another country.

You'll understand other people.

It's good to know more than one language.

Communicate with relatives.

To follow in the tracks of your ancestors.

You may regret not knowing it in later life.

We should know the language of our ancestors.

I like to do the homework.

You can speak to everyone.

Speak to grandparents.

You will understand if you go to the Ukraine.

You will learn better.

TABLE 9

WHY IS IT GOOD TO LEARN UKRAINIAN?
(Third Generation Children)

Don't know

When you'll grow up, you'll get a better job.

I want to be a pilot and it's needed.

You can understand older people.

Your grandparents speak it.

Yes. . . .(It's good)

Because my relatives speak it and I can't understand.

"TABLE 9-Continued."

It's good to have another language.

If you talk more languages you're better.

You can talk with relatives.

You can understand older people.

Millions of people talk it, and you can talk with them.

It's good to be bilingual.

Parents and relatives talk it.

It helps you when you grow up.

It's good to know another language.

---

friends and relatives who spoke Ukrainian. Second generation children reflected similar concerns. While a number of second generation respondents described the benefits of knowing a second language, third generation children were the most explicit about the actual benefits they saw. For them, it was not because of a particular link with the Ukraine, but because of advantages they saw for themselves in Canada.

Respondents were asked about the future of the Saturday morning Ukrainian school if public schools ever undertook instruction in Ukrainian on a regular basis. Only two parish children and four non-parish children felt that the Saturday Ukrainian instruction could be discontinued; the great majority believed that the Saturday school offered "extra things" such as dancing, singing, preparation for special concerts, history and culture. Respondents indicated that financial support from the government for Saturday schools would be appreciated. A Ukrainian school teacher pointed out that the Saturday school was responsible for socializing the children in a uniquely Ukrainian Orthodox

way that the public school could not be expected to fulfill, and the same general concern seems to have been expressed in the replies of parishioners, who were satisfied with the straightforward language-teaching programmes in public schools (for the time being). Replies showed a commitment to maintaining the ideal of multiculturalism and multilingualism.

In view of the fact that Saturday morning classes represented an extension of the school week for children whose friends of non-Ukrainian background were normally free, it was surprising that children attended the classes so seriously and indicated that they intended to continue attending. The most frequent response to the question "How much longer would you like to attend?", was "Until I learn enough," or similar words. Only one non-parish child stated that he intended to complete the year and then quit. While second generation children had somewhat of a "head start" in Ukrainian school because they listed Ukrainian as their native language, and may have been encouraged to master the language by anxious first generation immigrants, third generation children were not fluent and listed English as their native language. In spite of this, third generation children were not hostile about being "forced" to attend, and indicated that their attitude was one of appreciation and studious concern.

Forty-two per cent of all adults stated that they read books in Ukrainian or about Ukrainians compared to twenty-nine per cent of children. First and second generation respondents were more inclined to read books in Ukrainian while third generation children were more inclined to read books about Ukrainians.

Adults and children were queried about the possibility of giving household pets Ukrainian names. The issue was felt to be an important one in that opting for a "foreign-sounding" name would indicate that the individual did not feel awkward about his ancestry. Reluctance to use Ukrainian names might otherwise suggest compartmentalization of ethnicity instead of involvement on a day-to-day basis. Table 10 summarizes the responses:

TABLE 10

GIVING HOUSEHOLD PETS UKRAINIAN NAMES

	Adults	Children
Percentage that would consider	52	32
Percentage that would not consider	8	16
Percentage that was uncertain	40	52

The implications of the category of uncertain responses are interesting in that respondents frequently chuckled and said they had never really thought about it. While they did not show embarrassment, it was acknowledged that the larger society was not familiar with Ukrainian animal names and members of it might be perplexed. The tenor of responses suggested that if the general public was made more aware of other cultures then reluctance to use typically Ukrainian names might fade. It was recognized, for example, that "Fifi" was a French name that respondents had become familiar with through exposure to television shows.

Respondents were asked about their interest in visiting the Ukraine if they could choose between visiting several places in the world. Twenty-five per cent of the first generation hinted that the

current political situation would be inimical to their interests, and one man refused to comment altogether. Forty-two per cent of second generation children were afraid to go because they heard that it was dangerous and unfriendly there on account of the Communists. It is likely that second generation children were reflecting the fears of their parents, although one third generation child also felt that it would be a dangerous place for a "Ukrainian" to go. An interesting split in rationales for visiting the Ukraine emerged. Although nearly all said they would like to go, second generation adults and children stated that they would like to see relatives or more frequently, variations on the theme of "my parents and their parents and so forth were born there and I'd like to see where." One respondent stated she wanted "to find the roots" of her heritage. In contrast, third generation reasons were generalized expressions of curiousity. They "wanted to see what it's like," "see the different buildings and things" and "see how they live." For members of the third generation, there seemed to be little association between themselves, as descendants of Ukrainian immigrants, and the country of origin of their ancestors. The results suggest that third generation Ukrainians consider themselves to be particularly Canadian-Ukrainians and do not base their identification upon any symbolic link with the Ukraine as do second generation respondents. Non-parish adults expressed reluctance to go for political reasons in two cases, and children in one. Others indicated that they would also like to see what life was like "over there."

First generation adults attended church slightly more frequently than their second generation counterparts. Church attendance will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter.

Twenty-eight per cent of the adults said they understood and were able to follow the Ukrainian-language Mass well. Others stated that they understood "half and half" or not too well. A particular problem area seemed to be the formal language used in the Mass and sermon. All first generation adults said they understood the Mass well, and approximately fifty per cent of second generation adults said they did not. Nine children, or slightly less than half of second generation children stated that they feld they understood the Mass well, and no third generation children did.

The Church encourages members to follow the Mass and familiarize themselves with it by means of prayer books in which the Church service is printed. For the past fifteen years or so, these have also been available in a Ukrainian/English bilingual edition--one page is printed in Ukrainian and the facing page bears an English translation. Bilingual prayer books were used in nine families (41%). In two cases, adults used Ukrainian prayer books only; the rest used no prayer book at all.

In view of the number of parishioners whose understanding of the Church service was limited, and the suggestion in some parishes that English services should be implemented, parishioners were asked what they felt should be done by those who did not understand the Mass. In nearly all instances, parishioners replied that those who did not understand should consult the English portion of the prayer book. While other responses included "Sit still," "Ask the priest" and "Study Ukrainian," the position of the Church with respect to implementation of English is very firm. The outlook of the parish priest on this issue was that those members who gave the excuse of not understanding the Mass for their

infrequent attendance, did not understand their religious obligations. He cited the example of one Ukrainian Orthodox church in the United States that adopted an English language Mass and attendance rose considerably. Shortly afterwards, the novelty wore off and attendance dropped to a lower point than before. It rose again only when the Ukrainian language Mass was reinstituted.

The introduction of English as a step to hold membership does not seem to have been an issue for parishioners in the northside parish. Nearly all felt that English language services would be "too different." Three second generation children felt that it might be acceptable, while eight third generation children believed that it could be introduced but some of the specialness would be gone. Adults were quite adamant in their opposition to the introduction of English, saying that they would protest, and that if they wanted to hear an English church service they could go to any "English" church.

There are no Ukrainian Orthodox churches in Edmonton where English is used throughout. There is, however one Ukrainian Orthodox parish where a brief summary of the sermon is given in English. The summary falls at the very end of the church service at the point where the priest also reads the church bulletin and announces coming events in the parish. It is regarded as a somewhat radical departure by members of the northside parish, and the priest would not acknowledge it as a concession to English. Its position at the tail end of the service was felt to be indicative of the fact that it was a thing apart from the Mass, and more in the way of an additional lecture or reminder of the message of the sermon.

The traditional connection between the Ukrainian Orthodox church

and the development of Ukrainian nationalistic feeling (see Chapter I) is felt to be an important factor mitigating against the introduction of English into the Mass.

Nearly all adults in the study knew at least one prayer by memory in Ukrainian, compared to 33% of the children. The incidence of saying prayers at home, however, was low, and less than 50% of adults stated that they said them. Eleven per cent of the children reported that they said prayers at home before bedtime, before meals, etc. The implications of these figures will be discussed later.

While children and adults felt that Sunday school books should be bilingual in English and Ukrainian, most children stated that they were, in fact, being taught in English. The ramifications of English-language teaching of church dogma and preservation of a Ukrainian language Mass imply that parishioners are learning how to be Ukrainian and Orthodox in English, but support the Ukrainian language Mass because other than purely religious reasons are involved. Again, this finding will be examined in more detail in the next chapter.

With the exception of one family, all parishioners celebrated Ukrainian Christmas and Easter. These are the major Ukrainian Orthodox religious holidays which do not coincide with the Christmas and Easter celebrated by most other Canadians. In the one family, the father was employed away from home during these periods.

Thirty-six per cent of the children had attended Ukrainian summer camp where they would have received increased exposure to the native language and customs via informal contact with the Ukrainian language, arts and crafts. Those who had gone, however, indicated that they continued to address their friends at camp in English, but that they had a

good time. Again, it is suggested that children are learning about being Ukrainian albeit in English. English as a medium of communication appears to have no detrimental effects on ethnic identity inasmuch as the children seem to appreciate and show interest in learning about the traditions of their ancestors.

Adults were asked how they would feel about marrying someone not of Ukrainian ancestry. Strong objections were raised among 25% of adults who were almost always first generation Ukrainians. Other adults tended to have fatalistic outlooks, saying "if it happens, there's nothing you can do about it," or, "If you love someone, it doesn't matter." Children who ventured a reply stated that ancestry should not be an issue where love was involved. Respondents were less concerned with religious endogamy than with marriage to someone who was not of Ukrainian ancestry. However, when asked about the consequences of marrying someone who was not Ukrainian or Orthodox, many adults hesitated to reply. Some believed that it would not affect them significantly, while others predicted arguments and divorces. Although responses were varied and involved considerable hesitations, women seemed more optimistic than men, and discussed the matter at greater length.

Fifty per cent of adults participated in church-sponsored activities such as organizations, and choirs, and attended them frequently. Only teen-aged children belonged to organizations in the parish (there were no children's organizations per se), and had been members for one or two years. Membership in organizations and ethnic identity will be considered in greater detail in the next chapter.

Conclusions

The survey of qualitative responses suggests a number of generalizations concerning ethnic identity in the parish. Several of these, however, remain to be tested more rigourously in the next chapter.

One of the first generalizations that emerges is that spoken Ukrainian is on the decline in every-day life. After the first generation, whose attachment to the written and spoken language is partly a function of limited English capability, succeeding generations show less adherence to "living ethnically" (Fishman and Nahirny 1966: 93), or to "primordial" ethnicity. This is obvious in the increased use of English (especially where parents address children in Ukrainian and they reply in English), decline in the number of books and publications read in Ukrainian, limited acquaintance with the Mass and prayers, and reluctance to give Ukrainian names to pets.

However, interest in maintaining the language continues to be more prevalent than actual practice, and parishioners seemed to feel that there were still many families where Ukrainian was spoken "nearly all of the time," and that all that needed to be done was for parents and children to "talk more at home." Parishioners emphasized the home, rather than specific institutions as the place where the brunt of language instruction should be borne. This was felt to be an indication that language maintenance was both a family concern and an in-group concern. Respondents felt that the Saturday Ukrainian school should be continued in spite of the availability of public school instruction in Ukrainian, which suggests that there is still a strong internal commitment to the ethnic heritage within the ethnic group. The Saturday school instruction was distinct from anything that the public schools were expected to

provide, in that Ukrainian dancing, singing, history, and religious upbringing were felt to be responsibilities of the parish.

The decline in the amount of use of Ukrainian is due to natural factors operating between generations and not to assimilative pressures of any sort. Although the native language of third generation children was English, no third generation children felt that attending Ukrainian school was an ordeal, and replied that they wanted to attend for several more years. This is in marked contrast to the reservations held by Japanese children in Vancouver where there was anxiety about being set apart from the larger society (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1969: 107). Second generation children were attending because of an obligation to honour the memory of their ancestors (see section on why it is good to speak Ukrainian) and to uphold the symbolic allegiance to the ethnic group. While third generation children justified their attendance in terms of the benefits of being bilingual, it was interesting that they chose to study Ukrainian in the first place, inasmuch as any other language (French, for example) would have been able to fulfill the same function of broadening the individual's mind. The fact that a large proportion of children noted that "old people" spoke anglicized or "improper" Ukrainian suggests that they have carefully looked at the grammar and pronunciation and have made Ukrainian a painstaking object of study (see Nahirny and Fishman 1966 on cognitive-appreciative identity in Chapter II). Moreover, the very fact that the children were willing to commit themselves to several more years of study is impressive evidence for third generation loyalty and allegiance in their own right.

English-only church services were shunned because this would have

challenged the traditional and historical importance that the language has had in being the focal point of ethnicity. Even where intermarriage has occurred, children continue to acknowledge their Ukrainian background; in many ways their attitudes resemble those of the third generation with respect to attending Ukrainian school for several more years, saying that it is good to be bilingual (in English and Ukrainian), criticizing old peoples' anglicized Ukrainian, and saying that Saturday Ukrainian classes should be continued because they contribute more in the way of culture content courses. Their attitudes in connection with visiting the Ukraine are also similar to those of the third generation.

Although language attitudes, feelings with respect to the Ukraine, exogamy, etc. change within each generation, it is important to acknowledge the context within which they take place. The first generation has internalized many old-country values and customs prior to immigration; consequently, European political persecution plus limited command of English are influential in their conservative approach and reluctance to change many of their habits and customs.

The second generation, which was raised in an atmosphere of ethnic consciousness and frequently must use Ukrainian to communicate with (first generation) parents, has a more transmuted involvement with ethnicity, since the more immediate problem of coping with Canadian society has to be faced. First generation parental concerns that children remain loyal to the ethnic group are honoured out of an obligation to acknowledge the sacrifices made by their immigrant parents in coming to Canada; however, interest and proctice may be at odds with one another because both generations operate in different worlds. As a result, second generation allegiance to the group is maintained on a symbolic level

(i.e. "symbolic" ethnicity), in the sense that generalized pride in being of Ukrainian ancestry exists (speaking Ukrainian is good, visiting the Ukraine is like making a pilgrimage, etc.) but does not figure in the mundane aspects of daily life. For example, it is faster and more efficient to speak English to convey complex ideas and concepts. Similarly, inter-marriage is not perceived as a great threat to identity from the standpoint of second generation Ukrainians, for they do not speak the native language in the home themselves, nor do they conduct their lives in the manner of the first generation with its old country customs and superstitions.

It was only when non-routine ethnic concerns, such as why it was actually good to know Ukrainian, were called into question, that Ukrainian identity became more salient, and, as children of Ukrainian immigrants, their ideological sympathies with many of their parents' concerns came to the surface. The symbolic attachment to the values of the group persisted because it was learned from the first generation in the course of being in direct contact with "primordial" or first generation ethnicity. However, as the topic of Ukrainian national values was not a routine concern for most people in their day-to-day experiences with the larger society, opinions remained personal, unchallenged, and therefore, unaffected, until deliberately solicited. Thus, actual behavior that can be measured on a day-to-day basis is not a reliable indicator of real commitment to one's ethnic heritage. Different generations place their own emphasis on certain manifestations of ethnicity while leaving some of the more abstract values, such as underlying loyalty and sympathy with the group essentially unchanged.

The survey of qualitative data would tend to support the modified

form of the Nahirny and Fishman (1966) model that was presented in the second chapter. There is no evidence to show that the interest of the third generation is an example of "third generation return" (Hansen 1952), for the attitude of the second generationdoes not meetthe preconditions that make it possible for the third generation to effect its "return."

In short, the Hansen model predicts that the second generation will be ashamed of its immigrant connections, shun ethnic activities, and hold entirely ambivalent attitudes about the ancestral past. This does not appear to have been the case in the northside parish. Consequently, third generation ethnicity is more like a variation of second generation identity, rather than the marked contrast that has been suggested.

CHAPTER V

QUANTITATIVE DATA

Although a great deal can be said about the advantage of open-ended interviews in capturing fine nuances of expression, statistical operations of some sort are necessary to safeguard against making conclusions that are unjustified (Selltiz et al 1959: 76). Interesting "hunches" concerning ethnic identity from the previous chapter were translated into hypotheses to be tested by means of chi-square analysis.

> The chi-square test is a very general test which can be used whenever we wish to evaluate whether or not frequencies which have been empirically obtained differ significantly from those which would be expected under a certain set of theoretical assumptions.
>
> (Blalock 1960: 212)

For purposes of this study, "ethnic identity" was understood to be the sum of attitudes vis-a-vis the ethnic heritage that each individual reflected in his response to various items in the questionnaire. Of course the questionnaire did not attempt to cover every aspect of ethnic identity, but native language attitudes, commitment to the ancestral church, and numerous every-day situations involving ethnic self-expression have been recognized as being components of ethnic identity (Bociurkiw 1969) and were elicited in the questionnaire.

A summated scale was used in the scoring of responses to various items of the questionnaire. The responses were scored in such a way that a response indicative of the most favourable or most "nationalistic attitude was given the highest score (Selltiz et al 1959: 366). The

obvious disadvantage of this approach is, of course, the fact that "many patterns of response to the various items may produce the same score" (Ibid.: 369). Moreover,

> . . . different ways of getting to the same place may be equivalent from the point of view of the measurement goal that is being served. For example, if one weighs addition and subtraction equally in a concept of arithmetic ability, it makes sense to score the two individuals as equivalent in arithmetic ability, even though one is relatively strong in addition and the other relatively strong in subtraction. Similarly, it may make sense to say that the net degree of animosity toward a given attitudinal object is the same in two individuals even though the animosity expresses itself differently.
>
> (Ibid.: 370)

Each individual was assigned an ethnic score based on the number of points accumulated on all items. Respondents were subsequently divided into high and low scorers depending on their position above or below the median. The median for adult scores was 56.2, while the range was from 78.2 - 37.2. For children, the median was 52.05, and the range from 75.6 - 34.05.

The differences that were investigated were:

1. Differences among generations in terms of ethnic scores
2. Differences between ethnic scores of parents and children
3. Differences in native language use and generation
4. Differences in ethnic score and age at immigration
5. Differences in attitudes towards out-marriage and ethnic score
6. Differences in organizational participation in terms of ethnic scores
7. Sex differences in terms of ethnic scores
8. Differences in educational level
9. Differences in the knowledge of other languages

Data was arranged in a 2 x 2 table and it was assumed that results

at the .05 level or better indicated that there were significant differences between the populations being tested.

The Hypotheses

The first relationship that was investigated was the supposition that there would be significant differences between first generation Ukrainian adults and second generation Ukrainian adults. It was expected that first generation Ukrainian adults would generally be more conservative and nationalistic in the aftermath of political persecution in Europe. Table 1 (Appendix 3) shows there are differences at the .01 level. As a general group, the post World War II Ukrainian immigrants were better educated and more literate than any other Ukrainian immigrants who arrived before them (see Chapter I), and consequently, had definite ideas about shaping the opinions of other Canadian-Ukrainians in accordance with their own nationalistic sentiments. In Chapter I, the disparagement of spoken Canadian-Ukrainian as well as the lack of national consciousness were noted as one of the major areas of disagreement between the last wave of immigrants and their Canadian-born counterparts.

In order to test for a finer distinction between first generation immigrants age at immigration was examined. Of the sixteen first generation respondents in the study, three had immigrated in their preteen years. It had been postulated that those arriving in their midteens or later would not have been as exposed to as many "Canadianizing" influences in schools, and would have retained more of their Ukrainian customs and values. There were no significant differences found, and it is suggested that the fact of immigration itself was probably more

salient than age (see Table 3 in Appendix 3).

When differences between parental age at immigration and children's ethnic scores were investigated, no significant differences were found. This result will be discussed in relation to generational differences between parents and children (see Table 4 in Appendix 3 for results).

Sex differences were investigated in order to examine any differences between first generation males and females and second generation males and females (see Tables 5, 6, and 9 in Appendix 3), and no significant differences were found. Moreover, there were no significant differences between the children of first generation males and second generation males, nor were there significant differences between children of second generation females and first generation females (Tables 7 and 8 in Appendix 3).

The fact that there were no significant differences between males and females is unusual in view of the emphasis that has been placed on the woman in the Ukrainian Orthodox church in her role as "culture-bearer" (Kurdydyk 1973: 14; Ukrainian Women's Association of Canada 1970: 1 - 2). Female response was also shown to have been more conservative and dogmatic on issues pertaining to ethnic identity in Hobart (1966) and Bociurkiw (1969).

It was postulated that older children might have higher ethnic scores than younger children who would be less advanced in the life cycle and less exposed to the Ukrainian printed media, church youth group, etc. The cut-off point for age was set at ten years, after which time most respondents would have had a year of Ukrainian school, have been through Communion and Confession, Ukrainian summer camp, etc. No significant differences were found (Table 10). Although the age variable

may have been selected too arbitrarily to reflect significant differences, it is suggested that membership in a generation may be more salient. This will be discussed in a subsequent chapter. There were significant differences between second and third generation children at the .05 level (Table 2 in Appendix 3).

A hypothesis concerning differences in adult educational level and ethnicity was tested. The majority of respondents had completed junior high school, but few had completed senior high school (24% of those who replied to the question had junior high school education or less; 9% had senior high school, and 7% had some university training or the equivalent). The cut-off point was made at the completion of junior high school, and the division was based on the fact that of the low post World War II educational levels, the greatest proportion fell in the category of five years to grade eight (junior high school) (Porter 1973: 158). It was, therefore, postulated that there would be significant differences between those with a higher educational level and those with a lower one as has been found in a number of studies (Tyler 1965: 357; Bociurkiw 1969). However, no conclusive differences were found (Table 11 in Appendix 3). Similarly, there were no significant differences between children who had parents with a high educational level, and children who had parents with a low educational level (Table 12 in Appendix 3).

There were no significant differences between children whose native language was Ukrainian and children whose native language was English (Table 14). There were, however, significant differences in the native language that was learned for second and third generation children (Table 13 in Appendix 3). The native language of the third gener-

ation was English. The level of significance was .001.

Although the native language is a factor over which respondents have little control in terms of whether or not it will be taught to them, frequency of usage is. It was hypothesized that there would be significant differences between adults who used English more often than Ukrainian and adults who used Ukrainian most of the time. Results indicated that there were significant differences at the .01 level (Table 15 in Appendix 3). The hypothesis was pursued a stage further in order to test for significant differences between children whose parents used English in the home most of the time, and children of parents who used Ukrainian (Table 16 in Appendix 3). There were significant differences at the .05 level. Finally, it was postulated that there would be no significant differences between children who used English in the home and children who used Ukrainian in the home, and no significant differences emerged (Table 17 in Appendix 3). The results seem to indicate that exposure to the language, in so far as second generation respondents are concerned, is more important for ethnicity than actual use.

An hypothesis was advanced that adults who spoke or understood another language (in all instances this was a Slavic one) would have higher ethnic scores. Much material has been written concerning bilingualism, and its desirable end product, cognitive flexibility, which predisposes individuals to be tolerant and appreciative of other languages and cultures (Lambert et al 1974: 52; Darnell and Vanek 1974: 172), including an improvement in self-image (Macnamara 1974: 95-96). There were significant differences at the .05 level (Table 18 in Appendix 3). There were also significant differences between children whose

parents spoke another Slavic language and children whose parents did not at the .05 level also (Table 19 in Appendix 3). Children who were asked which other languages they felt should be taught in schools mentioned the official languages--English, and French, and German, and Ukrainian, plus a number of other "exotic" languages such as Japanese and "Mexican." Since no children named the other Slavic languages spoken by many of the (first generation) parents, it is suggested that the significant difference found in Table 19 may have reflected a generational difference.

Because a considerable number of children were favourably inclined towards studying French, and often commented on the superiority of French teaching materials, the differences between ethnic scores of children who were studying French and those who were not were investigated. It was found that there were significant differences at the .02 level (Table 20 in Appendix 3). Since there were no significant differences found between older and younger children (Table 10), it is unlikely that age would have been a factor among older children in that they may have been exposed to more French. The Lambert and Tucker (1972) longitudinal study of English Canadians who received enriched French training beginning in kindergarten showed them to have less ethnocentrism, more charitable attitudes towards other groups and "healthy views of themselves" (205-206). Moreover,

> This pattern was statistically significant and clear enough to be taken as an indication that suspicion and distrust between groups may be effectively reduced by means of this particular academic experience.
>
> (Ibid.: 206)

As bilinguals also show generalized sensitivity for sounds in a totally foreign language (Ibid.: 205), children already exposed to Ukrainian

may find French easier, and consequently, enjoy taking it.

There were significant differences between first and second generation adults where the issue of out-marriage was concerned. The differences were significant at the .001 level. Second generation Ukrainians frequently emphasized the importance of marrying an individual who was sympathetic towards Ukrainians and their language. Second generation Ukrainians were also less dogmatic about marrying non-Orthodox Ukrainians. Ukrainian Catholics were mentioned as "acceptable," perhaps because the old country rivalries between Orthodox and Catholics were less salient in a Canadian context for the second generation than for the first.

Participation in Ukrainian organizations is normally associated with a strong sense of identity, since organizations are usually formed to promote ethnic interests, and the two tend to be mutually reinforcing (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1969: 112). There were no significant differences between adults who participated in organizations and those who did not (Table 24 in Appendix 3). Neither were there significant differences between children who participated and children who did not (Table 25 in Appendix 3). Children are rarely members of organizations by definition, however, the Canadian Ukrainian Youth Association to which most belonged, had, as one of its aims, the goal to

> . . . cultivate love and respect to the Ukrainian people, to the Ukrainian language, and to the faith, customs and traditions of their forefathers.
>
> (Trosky 1968: 77)

The Association has published guidelines concerning the yearly activity programmes and meetings which are designed to promote these aims. Activ-

ities include regular concert programmes in keeping with the themes of each season, debates, folksinging and dancing, etc., ideally to be conducted in Ukrainian. The only vestige of Ukrainian at one such meeting was the beginning and opening prayer which was initiated by the priest, and which few could repeat on their own. The remaining business was carried out in English, and the main concern was where the group could go swimming during the coming week. Although the organization does fulfill the important function of keeping the youth together, it seems to have become a social club, rather than an ethnic club, because fluency in the native language has declined and there is less interest in drama, debates, singing, etc. that concerned earlier generations.

There were no significant differences between adults who attended church frequently and those who did not (Table 22). There were also no significant differences between children who attended church frequently and those who did not (Table 23 in Appendix 3). One of the arguments that has been advanced is that church attendance is the result of tradition and habit (Hofman 1966: 129). This would seem to be the case in view of the fact that adults and children who attended claimed to know little of what was actually happening and missed out on one of the most important ways of asserting one's Ukrainian identity is to attend the Ukrainian language service. The religion is less of an issue in view of the fact that individuals are not concerned that they do not understand the sermon--it is important to retain Ukrainian in the Mass because it would not seem right otherwise. As Goffman has pointed out,

> . . . if the principal ideal aims of an organization are to be achieved, then it will be necessary at times to by-pass momentarily other ideals of the organization, while maintaining the impression that these ideals are still in force. In such cases, a sacrifice is

made not for the most visible ideal but rather for the most legitimately important one.

(1959: 45)

Thus, the important impression of solidarity is fostered, even though individual members themselves may be incapable of contributing very much in the way of actual involvement. At least they would be reflecting their support for the Ukrainian group by attending.

Summary of Statistical Findings

The following table contains a summary of the hypotheses that were investigated and the significant differences that emerged.

TABLE 11

SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL FINDINGS

Hypothesis	Not Significant	Significant (.05 or greater)
First generation adults have higher ethnic scores than second generation adults		.01
Second generation children have higher ethnic scores than third generation children		.05
Immigrants who arrived at an early age have lower ethnic scores	X	
Children of immigrants who arrived at a later age have higher ethnic scores	X	
First generation males have higher ethnic scores than second generation males	X	
First generation females have higher ethnic scores than second generation females	X	
Children of first generation males have higher ethnic scores than children of second generation males	X	

"TABLE 11-Continued."

Children of first generation females have higher ethnic scores than children of second generation females	X	
Second generation males have higher ethnic scores than second generation females	X	
Older children have higher ethnic scores than younger children	X	
Adults with a low education have higher ethnic scores than adults with a high education	X	
Children of parents with a low education have higher ethnic scores than children of parents with a high education	X	
The native language of third generation children is English		.001
Children whose native language is Ukrainian will have higher ethnic scores	X	
Adults using English in the home have lower ethnic scores		.01
Children whose parents use English in the home have lower ethnic scores than children whose parents use Ukrainian		.05
Children who use English in the home have lower ethnic scores	X	
Adults who speak another Slavic language have high ethnic scores		.05
Children whose parents speak another Slavic language have high ethnic scores		.05
Children currently studying French have high ethnic scores		.02
First generation adults are more dogmatic than second generation adults where out-marriages is concerned		.001

"TABLE 11-Continued."

Adults who attend church frequently have high ethnic scores	X
Children who attend church frequently have high ethnic scores	X
Adults who participate in ethnic organizations have high ethnic scores	X
Children who participate in ethnic organizations have high ethnic scores	X

A discussion of the results obtained through statistical analysis and their import in relation to the qualitative data follows in Chapter VI.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION

In terms of statistical analysis, the sample size involved was moderate. On the other hand, a small sized sample requires more significant differences between variables if chi-square is to be at an acceptlevel of significance (Blalock 1960: 225). Therefore, in hypotheses where the level of significance was .05 or better, a fair degree of confidence in the results is justified.

Where the qualitative aspects of the data are concerned, there are many inherent restrictions on their completeness and accuracy, depending on respondents' frankness and willingness to share certain personal information. Nevertheless, the survey questionnaire continues to be one of the most useful instruments for providing a general picture (Darnell and Vanek 1974: 77). In this case, the population sample was as complete as possible: children and parents who were involved in the Saturday morning Ukrainian school were surveyed. The two methods of analysis have been combined in this study in order to arrive at an idea of the kind of ethnic identity and concern for maintaining the ethnic heritage in the parish.

As a modified form of the Nahirny and Fishman generational hypothesis for ethnic identity (1966: 351) was selected for comparative and evaluative purposes, the discussion will centre around "primordial," "symbolic," and "functional" identity.

As all respondents in the study were of Ukrainian ancestry, be-

longed to the same parish, and were involved in the activities of the Saturday and Sunday schools, the sample was by definition, very biased, and ought to have consisted of members with similar values and goals. However, the traditional assumption that people sharing the same sub-culture must have very similar ideas and lifestyles was not confirmed, for there was substantial difference between generations in the sample.

The First Generation

The first generation, composed of post World War II (or thereabouts) immigrants, had the highest ethnic scores for they generally expressed their commitment to maintain the Ukrainian heritage in the most vehement terms. The second generation, also had higher ethnic scores than the third. While the responses of each individual were ranked according to the amount of concern they exhibited, the categories that were used were intentionally designed to reflect as many nuances of opinion as were expressed by members in the parish. In spite of this, opinions given by each generation tended to cluster around certain issues, with the result that generational differences in ethnic scores were found to be among the most salient.

The first generation was found to have had the strongest opinions on how the language and culture of Ukrainians in Canada should be maintained. In Chapter I, the historical background surrounding World War II Ukrainian immigrants was discussed at length. They were more urban than the previous flows of more agricultural workers and, consequently, better educated. As such, they were politically more active in Europe because they were literate and familiar with the matters of the day. The last attempts to recreate an independent Ukrainian state date back to this

period and follow on the heels of the introduction of Stalinism, collectivization, and communism. Thus, when the second World War broke out, many seized the opportunity to welcome the Germans as liberators from Russian and Polish oppression. When attempts to establish an independent state proved unsuccessful, many found themselves in displaced persons camps, and alienated from the political system of post-war Ukraine as well. One solution was to emigrate.

Shortly after they had arrived in Canada, the years of the Cold War began, rendering the relations between East and West very strained. It soon became obvious that there would be little communication or exchange with Ukrainians behind the Iron Curtain. Consequently, Ukrainian immigrants abroad were convinced that any hopes for the survival of the group lay in the development of a diaspora consciousness whereby Ukrainians would preserve their culture and mount a campaign to condemn the actions of the Soviet government in the meantime. The old religious factionalism among long-established Ukrainian-Canadians was disparaged as a divisive mechanism in a time when a united front was needed to lobby in favour of governmental policies that might ameliorate the position of the Ukraine. The coming of the post World War II immigrants resulted in the formation of strong nationalistic organizations that were highly anti-communist and dedicated to the Ukrainian "cause" (for example, the League for the Liberation of the Ukraine which was the largest has only recently joined the Ukrainian Canadian Committee). First generation immigrants also strongly supported Conservative Prime Minister Diefenbaker who repeatedly spoke out against Soviet Oppression:

> Anti-communist propoganda and propoganda for a free Ukraine were among the group's chief, if not exclusive, activities. Success appeared near at hand when in 1959 Prime Minister Diefenbaker at the United

> Nations criticized Soviet "colonial" policy and made a plea for Ukrainian independence.
>
> After 1959, the latest Ukrainian immigrants supported Diefenbaker and it is safe to say that his pro-Ukraine, anti-communist stand was the decisive factor in winning their allegiance. Neither of the earlier Ukrainian groups displayed such allegiance to Diefenbaker.
>
> (Pobihushchy 1968: 28)

Their intense zeal and experiences were clearly geared to the Ukraine, which continued to be the object of their concern and orientation. Because their fluency in English was limited, Ukrainian was naturally the language that was used in the home (as per first generation replies in the parish), and Ukrainian customs and superstitions were adhered to, becoming all the more precious because their survival depended on the immigrants' dedication to the heritage.

Moreover, maintaining ties with other first generation immigrants was important because it afforded the opportunity for reminiscences and discussion. In the sample, first generation immigrants used a special term for other first generation Ukrainians who originated from the same Ukrainian province or region, even though they only met by chance in Canada. The term "mij Zemlyak" (my compatriot) is used as a form of address, and indicates the immigrant's continuing bond to the old country.

Although only a few first generation homes in the parish were visited, preference for Ukrainian-style pottery, embroidered cloths, and pictures of Ukrainian national heroes and poets were frequent items of decor[1], and indicated that a preference for a "Ukrainian lifestyle existed. In the sense that their way of living was profoundly geared to the

---

[1] As a former Ukrainian school instructor in a large Winnipeg parish (1969-1972) I found this to have been true in most first generation homes which I visited when I took children Christmas carolling.

Ukraine, the term "primordial" ethnicity (Nahirny and Fishman 1966: 351) (attempt to replicate life in the Ukraine) is entirely suitable to describe their response.

Because they represented the last major flow of nationalistically inclined immigrants to come, there is evidence to support the claim that the first generation sees itself as an elite (see Pohorecky and Royick 1969 on early signs of separatism between immigrants and Canadian-Ukrainians) who must ensure that the solidarity of the Ukrainian ethnic group is not weakened by influences which might divert the group from the cause of the Ukraine. Consequently, there is dissapproval of inter-marriage on principle, because of the fear that the individual's energies may no longer be fully attuned to the survival of the group. In so far as first generation immigrants are concerned, interest in maintaining the language and traditions of the group must coincide with practice. Indeed, their own life is an example of this, largely because their past experiences have left them with no other alternative. As a result, the first generation continues to read books and publications in Ukrainian, knows the most prayers, and attends church and church-sponsored organizations more than any other group in the sample. The Church stands as an example of the nationalist struggle in the Ukraine, for Ukrainian priests were interned by communists in Europe and religious worship in the Soviet Union was frowned upon. Ukrainian Catholics are preferred if Orthodox Ukrainians cannot be found; but Catholicism was not the original religion of the Ukrainian people (see Chapter I), and Catholics are frequently felt to be Catholics first and then Ukrainians. Any change to an English language Mass is abhorred since this would be breaking tradition. "If I want to hear it in English I'll go to a United Church" was the reply of

one man for whom the native language and the ancestral religion were intimately bound up.

Although first generation respondents were reluctant to ever visit the Ukraine again, this was the result of fear of political reprisal and intolerance towards the existing regime. First generation parents evidently spoke about their life and experiences in the Ukraine as their children also mentioned that the Ukraine was "filled with communists who hated Ukrainians."

Because orientation to the Ukraine continues to be such an integral part of daily life, the question relating to why it was good to speak Ukrainian proved to be superfluous. The first generation had always spoken Ukrainian and for them, English was the foreign language. Pets in the home (in the Ukraine this meant cattle and other animals) were given Ukrainian names or else respondents were favourably inclined to give Ukrainian names instead of English ones out of habit.

While nearly all first generation Ukrainians spoke or understood at least one other Slavic language, this seemed to have been the result of forced contact with Russians or Poles in Europe. A number also understood German from being in labour camps. Speaking another language has been commonly associated with greater cognitive flexibility and tolerance of other languages and cultures (Lambert et al 1974: 52), however, in this case, toleration of Canada's second official language, French, was minimal. Although there were significant differences between those adults who spoke another Slavic language and those who did not, knowledge of the language was the result of a European background that was not associated with pleasant memories.

When respondents were asked which language(s) they felt should be

taught in public schools, Ukrainian was immediately listed, and the utility of French was questioned. In a sense, it was seen as a government effort to undermine the importance of Ukrainian by stressing the equality of French and English and subsidizing French programme in schools. As immigrants who were familiar with Russian and Polish attempts to diminish the importance of Ukrainian in Europe, lack of encouragement of the Ukrainian language meant that even abroad their hopes could not be realized. To many, the Prairies represented an area of Ukrainian settlement where Ukrainians outnumbered the French, and government support of French was a threat to the precarious Canadian base upon which the ongoing existence of the group relied.

The Second Generation

Nahirny and Fishman (1966) have described second generation ethnicity as "symbolic" ethnicity because it is virtually impossible to replicate the experiences, and by extension, the orientation of the first generation. The context is different; however, by listening to the reminiscences of their parents, children can relate to a number of generalized attributes of the Ukraine and understand the values their parents hold. Songs sung in Ukrainian school mention the steppes and cherry orchards of the Ukraine, while text books are full of pictures of thatched houses, although children can never grasp the full significance of living in such a place. Similarly, many customs lose their real significance because they are alien to Canadian life. Whistling in the house, for example, is no longer associated with bad luck in a culture where it is customary to "whistle while you work." Indeed, the native language is used less often in the home, and it is more efficient to communicate with siblings in

English. The second generation is bilingual and bicultural--all second generation respondents listed Ukrainian as their native language and declared that they had learned it from their parents, who had no other means of communicating with them. When school began, they learned English, and came into increasing contact with the larger society. A number of second generation respondents stated that as they grew older, they knew less and less Ukrainian compared with English, and often did not know Ukrainian equivalents for more complex concepts. Their parents were not familiar with them either. Consequently, their skills in Ukrainian were limited to cases where they were used with persons who did not know English or else for special occasions in the family circle.

Fewer Ukrainian books and publications were read, possibly because a command of English gave them a wider range of choices.

Similarly, respondents knew fewer prayers in Ukrainian, as they were generally less religious than their parents. For the first generation, religion was something they had fought to preserve in the Ukraine; for the second generation, it was taken more for granted as they were born into it. Moreover, in the Ukraine, Orthodoxy had been a national religion, and consequently work was not done on holy days and people were accustomed to attending church and learning the appropriate prayers and observations. In contrast, few second generation Ukrainians could afford to take time off work or school to be present at services for all of the various holy days that fell in the middle of the week. While first generation Ukrainians generally observe sanctions against engaging in manual labour on Sundays (i.e. even using scissors to cut something is frowned upon),[2] these strictures tend to be ignored by second generation respondents who do not anchor them into the same old-country context.

---

[2]Conversation with J. F. in 1973.

In spite of the fact that speaking the native language and observation of other traditions do not constitute a daily part of living, the more abstract, national values their parents cherished are appreciated largely out of a sense of obligation to reaffirm that their parents' efforts were not in vain. A sense of obligation and loyalty to the principles of the Ukrainian "cause" are evident in second generation support of the native language in theory--there is a dedication to uphold Ukrainian because it is the language of the ancestors, and "just as good as any other" (see Chapter IV). Adult second generation respondents felt that the group is threatened by government efforts to "push" French, for French is made out to be "better" (i.e. more useful in Canada) than Ukrainian. This would, of course, detract from the meaning and significance of their parents' struggles and immigration to Canada for the express purpose of preserving their national heritage because they did feel it was important. Second generation respondents are also not in favour of abolishing the Ukrainian language Mass because of the important historical connection the Church played in promoting the Ukrainian language and Ukrainian nationalism. Moreover, there is a feeling, learned no doubt from nationalistically-oriented parents, that there is a connection between being of Ukrainian ancestry and an ability to speak Ukrainian. Respondents apologized whenever they believed they did not pursue Ukrainian as much as they could have. A typical orientation towards Ukrainian customs and language was expressed by a second generation Ukrainian at a joint French-Ukrainian cultural evening staged by university students from both ethnic groups. Throughout, the Ukrainian group stressed the equality of Ukrainian and French, and emphasized the contribution the Ukrainian group made to Canada. In charge of the ceremonies

for the Ukrainian group was one second generation Ukrainian who repeatedly reaffirmed second generation loyalty to the group in phrases such as the following used to describe a Canadian-born Ukrainian quartet:[3]

> They have never seen the Ukraine, for they were born on foreign soil, but their Ukrainian soul is full of music, songs of beauty, youthful enthusiasm and inner nobility. . . .

A group of Ukrainian dancers evoked the following description:[4]

> A small, but integral facet of the gem of Ukrainian culture is folk dancing; it is this facet the youth have chosen for their contribution to the emerging Canadian culture--not only because it seems more radiant than any other but also as an obligation as Canadians to propagate the heritage handed down to them by their forefathers who came to Canada in search of freedom and human dignity. . . .

Similar symbolic ties to the Ukraine are also evident in second generation feelings vis-a-vis visits to the Ukraine. Visiting the Ukraine resembled a pilgrimage in that it was to see the land their parents speak about frequently, and because it is the mysterious country of their forefathers.

Nevertheless, there is a strong contrast between second generation allegiance to their ethnic group and their actual behavior on a daily basis. The difference is particularly apparent when a comparison between "primordial" ethnicity and "symbolic" is made. In so far as intensity of loyalty to the group is concerned, second generation respondents resemble their parents quite closely. This is possible because day-to-day "primordial" ethnicity is motivated by the same kind of ideology as in symbolic ethnicity, except that the ideology is reinforced by experience. Experience can never be a factor in symbolic ethnicity, consequently

---

[3] From a manuscript read by N. R. at Festival '74, 1974.

[4] Ibid.

"symbolic" ethnicity does not become salient except for special occasions, such as defending the right of Ukrainians to teach their language in public schools. On a daily basis, though, the bicultural and bilingual aspect of the second generation's existence requires that a great portion of all contact must be made with the English-speaking sector of society, so that second generation Ukrainians rapidly outgrow their association with the day-to-day enactment of "primordial" ethnicity. The fact that many noted that their competence in Ukrainian decreased as they got older is indicative of this process.

Second generation Ukrainians were much less dogmatic than the first generation on the issue of out-marriage, perhaps because their own marriages did not live up to the expectations and models provided by the immigrants. Since speaking Ukrainian and adhering to Ukrainian traditions did not enter into the lives of second generation partners who were both of Ukrainian ancestry (and whose native language was Ukrainian), there was not going to be very much difference if the other partner was not of Ukrainian ancestry. Second generation adults did, indeed, stress that it was important to marry someone who would be sympathetic to the Ukrainian language, suggesting that a partner who would understand and respect the Ukrainian language and culture was acceptable. Non-parish adults who had mixed marriages indicated that their spouses were quite supportive and viewed their Ukrainian background as an extra dimension of their personality.

At the beginning of Chapter III it was pointed out that two sets of second generation respondents were tested: adults and children. Adults were in their mid thirties to forties which means that their growing years would have coincided with the time of the Cold War when com-

munism was a concern, and Canadian Prime Minister Diefenbaker condemned Soviet treatment of Ukrainians in Europe. The "cause" of Ukrainians was supported by the Canadian government and in this sense, added to Ukrainians' improved self-image. Shortly thereafter, the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism was created, and members of the "other ethnic groups" outlined their discontent with such a narrow definition of Canadian society. Second generation Ukrainians in the parish were undoubtedly also influenced by the World War II immigrants who revitalized the Ukrainian community by injecting an additional spurt of nationalistic feeling and pride in the literature and culture of the Ukraine. As Pohorecky and Royick (1969) have pointed out, second generation Ukrainians were enrolled in the newly-created courses offered by equally newly-established Departments of Slavic Studies founded by the intellectual element of the post war immigration. Second generation Ukrainians in the parish recognized articulate first generation immigrants as leaders in the church executive, and in organizations. The priest in the parish was also a first generation immigrant who stressed the importance of retaining the language and customs, and conducted adult classes in Ukrainian on his own time in the evening. The close association of young second generation Ukrainians with the nationalistically inclined post-war immigrants arriving after the final attempts to re-establish an independent state seems to have resulted in the formation of attitudes closely resembling those of second generation children. Attitudes relating to Ukrainian language instruction were particularly similar with respect to the orientation to the Ukraine which was demonstrated in Chapter IV. Moreover, the parents of second generation adults were themselves associated with the second major flow of Ukrainians that

followed the first abortive attempts to set up the Ukrainian state. The contributions of the second major wave of immigrants in establishing Ukrainian language newspapers and non-sectarian Ukrainian nationalist organizations bent on liberating the Ukraine were discussed in Chapter I. Primarily because of the historical background, i.e. between two major flows of strongly pro-Ukraine immigrants, the values and attitudes of second generation adults in the parish sample paralleled those of second generation children.

A number of second generation adults stated that they did not understand several parts of the Ukrainian language Mass, including the sermon. There was reluctance, however, to implement any English, but the issue at stake was not so much the religious implications that this might have, inasmuch as respondents were less concerned with Orthodoxy than with ethnic identity. In Chapter IV, it was noted that second generation Ukrainians who knew fewer prayers and attended the Mass less frequently, had fewer objections about marriage to someone who was not Orthodox than to someone who was not Ukrainian. The role of ritual was also discussed, and the suggestion was made that the church was a place wherein members of the ethnic group re-enact their loyalty through the symbolism of a ritual not clearly understood. Organizational participation also paralleled this dichotomy. In the parish, first generation adults were the key figures in church-sponsored ethnic organizations while second generation adults accepted their guidance. Most business was carried out in Ukrainian, as a result. Among the children, however, the second and third generation conducted their meetings in English in order to deal effectively with the concerns at hand, such as organizing a (Ukrainian) choir,

planning recreational activity, etc. The actual mechanical or routine functions were carried out in English, while Ukrainian was reserved for traditionally staged, special occasions. The dichotomy suggests that the second generation (children) does indeed carry out day-to-day activities in the home and in organizations in English, and reverts to the Ukrainian aspect of its heritage during selected times such as in church, to re-affirm its connection with the group.

The differences between "primordial" and "symbolic" ethnicity are further evident in the attitudes of the second generation towards the quality of Ukrainian spoken by "old" people, who are no longer considered language models as many of their habits are out-dated and out of context. Second generation Ukrainians who were raised in a pro-Ukraine environment tend to reaffirm their parents' condemnation of "slang" or anglicized Ukrainian spoken by older Canadian-Ukrainians who also speak regionalized Ukrainian dialects with Russian, Polish, Hungarian etc. influences and are therefore considered "impure" (see Pohorecky and Royick 1969 on specific differences). Because Ukrainians dating back to the second immigration constituted members of the peasantry in significant numbers, their ways tend to be even less in keeping with Canadian society than first generation immigrants of the second World War. Their activities would represent the extreme example of authentic or "primordial" ethnicity for the second generation.[5] As the "old" people would also tend to be in their sixties, they would be far removed from the current modern concerns of the parish, hence would not serve as models in the new bicultural context.

---

[5]Conversations with P. L. in 1973.

There seems to be little support for the claim that second generation Ukrainians speak Ukrainian less and observe Ukrainian customs less because they are somehow ashamed of their ancestry (Hansen 1952; Nahirny and Fishman 1966). Second generation children unanimously stated their intention to pursue Ukrainian language instruction for several more years, in contrast to other ethnic groups (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1969: 107). Both second generation children and adults believed that Ukrainian should be taught in public schools. Moreover, they indicated that Saturday morning Ukrainian schools should be continued even in the event that Ukrainian would be taught regularly in public schools. More important, however, the home was emphasized as the place where language instruction should begin. The most frequent response concerning ways to encourage children to learn Ukrainian was "speak it at home" rather than "send them to school." The priest and the Saturday morning school were not assigned the primary responsibility of encouraging and teaching Ukrainian as has been the case for other ethnic groups where language maintenance efforts are ineffective (Fishman and Nahirny 1966: 92-126).

In terms of educational level in the parish, there were significant differences between those with junior high school education or less, and those with senior high school or more. Since there were so few professionals in the parish, it may be argued that the parish was too internally similar to bring out these differences. However, a short survey carried out among the parents of preschoolers in a more affluent southside parish of approximately the same size where there was a high proportion of engineers, teachers, etc., indicated that parents felt as con-

cerned about their heritage as those on the north-side.[6] Interviews with third generation adolescents from the same parish who came once a week to correct the homework they had in high school Ukrainian classes in the city also confirmed their concern.[7] Bociurkiw (1969) has also pointed out that children of professionals continue to have a strong sense of ethnic identity, frequently greater than the concern felt among working class Ukrainians. To the extent that the southside parish was "affluent" enough to conduct a Ukrainian pre-school class and finance instruments for a Ukrainian children's orchestra, there was more cultural activity than in the north-side parish. These results tend to dispute those results of the assimilation model which suggest that higher socio-economic status associated with Canadian-born children of immigrants leads to increased "assimilation" and loss of ethnic identity.

Rather, the configuration of identity for the second generation is different. Emphasis is placed on the Ukrainian past, and the ideological issues for which Ukrainians fought are stressed. In Canadian society, second generation Ukrainians are, by definition, bilingual and bicultural, therefore it is unfair to compare their day-to-day behavior with the primarily monolingual Ukraine-oriented lifestyle of their immigrant parents and deduce from that that ethnic identity is being eroded. If loyalty to tradition and pride in the achievements of the group are examined instead, there is a close similarity between the two generations. A particularly revealing example of second generation desire to identify

---

[6] Interviews conducted with parents of preschoolers in the class of Mrs. P. Sembaliuk, 1973.

[7] Interviews conducted with members of the class of Mr. W. Wintonyk in 1973.

with Ukrainian national values and accomplishments is found in the following description given by a second generation Ukrainian of an early Ukrainian philosopher. An earnest attempt to equate Ukrainian heroes with those of western Europe is made, in order to integrate them into the western tradition in which Canadian society operates:

> He would not, however, have minded chatting with Jean Jacques Rousseau. (No doubt they would have chatted beautifully in Latin). Socrates would have liked the simple and natural way of life of Skovoroda. He and Rama Krishna of India would have been glad to meet Skovoroda, if all three of them lived in the same century and country. Emerson, no doubt, would have been very much interested in Skovoroda's ideas had he had a chance to read his works. . . .
>
> (Ewach 1972: 15)

The Third Generation

All third generation respondents in the study were children, only one of whom listed his native language as Ukrainian. The question that remains to be answered is why second generation Ukrainian parents whose native language is Ukrainian, do not transmit it to their children. The key lies in the different orientations inherent in "symbolic" and "functional" ethnicity (Nahirny and Fishman 1966: 351). In the previous section, it was explained why speaking Ukrainian every day does not constitute a significant portion of second generation ethnic identity. As a result, children have no real opportunity to learn it at home. All children who replied that they learned the most about speaking Ukrainian from their grandparents or the school were third generation Ukrainians. The mainstay of second generation identity was their support of first generation ideology, for they grew up hearing about it, and formulating generalized ideas about the Ukraine. It is more difficult, however, for one set of generalizations to beget another set, consequently, it is harder for the third generation, who has never been in close contact with

"primordial" ethnicity to understand what their parents' loyalty to the Ukraine is all about. This is obvious in third generation views of the Ukraine as a place to visit. Rather than regarding it as a pilgrimage to the land of their ancestors, it becomes another place to see, just to discover how the people "over there" live. At a local Edmonton Ukrainian concert where a second generation Ukrainian read an emotional plea for all Ukrainians to love the heritage and honour the sacrifices of Ukrainians, a third generation Ukrainian in the audience commented that she could not understand how it was possible to get so "worked up" about a place "you'd never seen."[8] Moreover, Ukrainians in the USSR are dissimilar from Ukrainians in Canada as far as third generation Ukrainians are concerned. Conditions "over there" are primitive, and the people are more Russian than Ukrainian according to two respondents.

Second generation parents and their children are nevertheless concerned about maintaining their native language in as much as children are encouraged to attend Ukrainian school, and those who do, seem to want to prolong the experience. A difference in motivation, however, reflects the difference in the "symbolic" and "functional" mode of orientation (Nahirny and Fishman 1966: 351). Whereas the second generation had been interested in learning Ukrainian in order to perpetuate the language of the ancestors, the third generation felt that it was good to learn Ukrainian because it was good to learn "any language." Respondents suggested that it broadened the mind, and therefore was functional in a Canadian context. One boy pointed out that he wanted to be a pilot and thought it would be useful.[9] Ukrainian was stressed as a practical and

---

[8]Discussion with P.L. over a speech by N.R., at Festival '74 Jubilee Auditorium.

[9]Interview with R.H. in 1972.

logical language to learn in view of the number of Ukrainians in Edmonton, and because respondents were of Ukrainian ancestry themselves; many in fact, believed that it was easier to learn Ukrainian if one was of Ukrainian ancestry because exposure to it in a variety of contexts would be more frequent.

The third generation did not exhibit the pro-Ukraine sentiments of its parents. Since the third generation has been raised by bilingual and bicultural parents with limited contact with their grandparents' way of life, they must rely on an alternate justification which is meaningful in a Canadian context. The new explanation for language maintenance comprises an aspect of "cognitive-appreciative" orientation, because the ethnic heritage becomes an "object of cognition" (Nahirny and Fishman 1966: 351)--i.e. it is studied for its own sake. Learning Ukrainian allegedly broadens the mind, hence it is relegated to the level of an enrichment lesson, and treated much like any other school subject. Moreover, it is important, as in any subject, to learn the material "correctly"--third generation children felt that "old people" spoke ungrammatical Ukrainian, because the textbook Ukrainian they were learning had to be more proper.

It seems unlikely that third generation attitudes towards Ukrainian language learning are intentionally less nationalistic in order to avoid conflict with Canadian values. Not only did respondents indicate that they wanted to attend longer, but suggested that Ukrainian should be one of the languages taught in public schools. Many, in fact, suggested that it would be nice if Ukrainian were taught like French, using the same quality of materials. French was also mentioned as one language that should be taught, along with several more exotic languages including

Japanese and "Mexican." In contrast to second generation adult views vis-a-vis French language instruction, third generation children were favourably inclined towards French, for the symbolic loyalty and obligation to the first generation "cause" is too far removed from third generation experience to promote a second generation kind of defensive pride in speaking Ukrainian. A test showing significant differences between children currently studying French and those who are not suggests that exposure to several languages (in Canada) contributes to a greater cognitive flexibility (Lambert et al 1974: 52) and acceptance of self, as well as other languages and cultures.

Although the third generation understands more Ukrainian than it is able to speak, the chi-square test showed that there were no significant differences between those who spoke English and those who spoke Ukrainian. Many children with high scores as well as with low ones used English in the home nearly all of the time. It is suggested that for the third generation, speaking English is no longer associated with low ethnic scores as much as it was for parents, and the emerging trend is to champion Ukrainian identity on an English language base. Where second generation adults were concerned, the fact that their native language was Ukrainian at least figured in their ability to use it on special occasions or else when there was a need, hence it was linked in a significant manner to their ethnic identity. Third generation children knew almost no Ukrainian, therefore it no longer was linked conclusively to their ethnic score. Nonetheless, speaking English for the third generation was not associated with low ethnic scores either, inasmuch as their involvement in other areas of parish life showed that they were concerned with their ethnic heritage. While the second generation's mode of ethnic

expression was restricted more to ideological support of the Ukrainian cause (interest versus practice), the third generation seemed to pursue and consciously show interest in the material aspects of the Ukrainian heritage. Nahirny and Fishman have described the object of their orientation as the historical past, compared to the ideological past of the second generation (1966: 351). Third generation children particularly enjoyed the singing and dancing aspects of Ukrainian school classes, as they were tangible expressions of the culture. It was largely because the Saturday school taught these in addition to language classes that children felt that Saturday school should be continued in spite of increased public school instruction. Easter-egg painting and embroidery also received much attention, because as arts and crafts, they could be fitted into the Canadian environment.

Because fluency in the native language was so limited, third generation children were being taught Ukrainian history and religious dogma in English, with the result that they were learning to be Orthodox Ukrainians via another language. The same type of (successful) substitution of one language for instructive purposes in another, has been a rallying point for identity among the Jews for a long time as well (Rosenthal 1965).

In spite of the fact that the third generation had almost no comprehension of the Mass or sermon, respondents, by and large, seemed very satisfied to leave things as they were. The ritual in the Church was important to retain intact, for it was a visible legacy from the past, rather than an abstract one. Like studying Ukrainian, church attendance was treated like a school subject--history and dogma of the Church were taught in English and <u>learned</u> rather than absorbed as would be more the

case for native speakers.

Participation in church-sponsored ethnic organizations, in contrast, did not differ for second or third generation respondents. There was little in the regular youth club sessions to differentiate them from most social or recreational gatherings. Ukrainian arts and crafts were learned whenever a church bazaar was imminent, or else when the appropriate season rolled around. For the most part, the church organization fulfilled the function of keeping the youth of the parish together and encouraging the formation of secondary ties with members of one's own ethnic group. Friendship patterns nearly always included a friend with a Ukrainian-sounding last name, but it was rare for a best friend to be from the parish, in contrast to the friendship patterns of adults. It is suggested that the reason may have been the result of the fact that adults formed their friendships more on the basis of persons they saw regularly in church, while children formed relationships with those they attended classes with in public school (and saw every day).

It is difficult to predict the nature of children's participation in ethnic organizations when they grow up, as children in general are not by definition members of organizations. However, inasmuch as they are learning the rudiments of Ukrainian history, religion, and the native language in addition to socializing with their peers in the parish, they are slowly assuming a place in the ethnic community. Public acceptance of the concept of multiculturalism and increased public school instruction in Ukrainian commencing with the first grade would tend to reinforce third generation identity by making it a greater part of daily life than it has been.

Klymasz has written that

> The gradual loss of the mother tongue among the Canadian-born and the accompanying reduction of the folk heritage into optical, acoustic and tactile manifestations has, in turn, prompted the exaggeration of their features and their transformation into the dominant elements of Ethnic Pop. This kind of exaggeration is most vividly illustrated by the cross-stitch motif which has become the single most pervasive symbol of Ukrainian-Canadian ethnicity;
> . . . The culmination of this process of adaptation is found in the circulation of English-language books and pamphlets on how to cook, embroider and even sing Ukrainian, and finally, in the open declaration of the right to be different. "It's fun to be Ukrainian" reads one of the popular inscriptions found on T-shirts and campaign buttons sold at Ukrainian festivals and souvenir stores.
>
> (1972: 11-12)

The emphasis on material culture is in contrast to the less tangible, ideological support given to the Ukrainian heritage by the second generation, and has been labelled as "third generation return" (Hansen 1952: 495). Upon closer examination, it is not really a return at all, merely an alternative form of ethnic expression. If the third generation siezes upon the more obvious manifestations of the heritage, it is because its own experience with the culture has been limited on account of little contact with the original, or "primordial" ethnicity of its grandparents. In short, there is a kind of revitalization of selected aspects of "primordial" ethnicity (in the sense that behavior rather than interest is featured) precisely because they have never known it (Nahirny and Fishman 1966: 343). Aspects of the heritage are subsequently transformed into concepts and behaviors that make sense in a third generation environment: Ukrainian language lessons are useful because they broaden the mind; Ukrainian arts and crafts are eagerly pursued because they help to add another dimension to the personality.

Summary

Because the history of the Ukrainian group has been fraught with

misfortunes and repeated attempts to establish their own autonomous state have failed, it is not surprising that first generation immigrants from each of the three major migrations should feel that the future of the group and its survival depend on their crusading efforts in Canada.

Immigrants who arrived in the late 1800's to perpetuate their peasant culture were shunned by the majority of those they encountered in Canada because of their reluctance to be absorbed into the mainstream of Canadian life. The abolition of bilingual Ukrainian/English schools, and misunderstandings concerning their allegiance during the First World War only served to increase their feelings of persecution, and stimulated them to redouble their efforts to preserve their old-country habits and customs.

The following wave of immigrants arrived after the First World War ended, and the Ukrainian state collapsed (mid nineteen-twenties). Fresh from attempts to launch the first autonomous Ukrainian state, they were strongly nationalistic, and established a large number of ethnic organizations and newspapers to promote their views and work for the renewed liberation of the Ukraine. They were instrumental in adopting the designation "Ukrainian," and organizing the Ukrainian Orthodox Church modeled after the traditional religion of their ancestors. Members of the second immigration numbered among the parents of second generation adults in the study.

Immigrants of the third major immigration were generally better-educated and more articulate. They had survived collectivization under the Stalinist regime, and were strongly anti-Soviet. During the years of the Second World War there were two attempts to achieve Ukrainian independence in Europe, thus they were strongly nationalistic as well, and

cognizant of the fact that political events in Europe meant that they could not be repatriated. As those who remained behind were locked into the Soviet system, survival of the Ukrainian language and traditions could be secured only if they developed a conservative outlook in matters relating to assimilation. Nearly forty per cent of respondents in the study were post World War II immigrants.

As the sample consisted of Ukrainian Orthodox respondents who were connected with the Saturday morning Ukrainian school, on the surface it would have been supposed that all members should share similar goals and values, inasmuch as they belonged to the same sub-culture in the parish. However, there were important differences in ethnic scores, and by extension, in expressions of ethnic identity, that were based on generational distinctions. Quantitative analysis showed that the first generation had the highest ethnic scores, followed by the second, and then the third. Qualitative analysis, however, suggested that the distinctions were not based on assimilation either, for the assimilation model could not account for the fact that Ukrainian-Canadian behavior did not seem to show particular affinity towards the "host society."

An alternative, broad framework for reference suggesting that cognitive sharing was not a prerequisite for the maintenance of ethnicity was discussed. Generational differences in mode of ethnic expression were more compatible with this model, for it stressed the concepts of unity and diversity at the same time. Differences in mode of ethnic expression (ethnic score) were viewed as natural outgrowths of the inability to communicate and perpetuate immigrant ethnicity out of its original, old-country context. Although immigrants' children may have been raised in an atmosphere of strong ethnic traditions and loyalty to the group, the

learning experience in a different environment and under different circumstances tended to be selective, and meaningless features of immigrant ethnicity were given less emphasis. Support and allegiance to the ethnic group were continued, but actual behavior sometimes appeared to be in conflict with beliefs.

The third generation was further removed from immigrant ethnicity and the reasons that gave rise to it; continued participation in ethnic organizations and maintenance of traditions required a justification and suitable framework for the context in which they lived.

The types of ethnic identity in the parish were named primordial, symbolic, and functional, in relation to the mode of expression in each. The modes of expression were personal-affective, symbolic affective, and cognitive-appreciative, according to the experiences of the individuals involved.

First generation identity was described as primordial, for it represented the first, original stage of the transplant from the old country to Canada. First generation Ukrainians had a strong diaspora consciousness built on the denial of freedoms and persecution, particularly in the Soviet Union. They spoke Ukrainian nearly always, and criticized Canadian or other foreign intrusions into the speech of other Ukrainians, because it meant that they were careless about preserving the purity of the native language. A unique friendship with other first generation Ukrainians existed to the point where they were addressed by special terms. Church attendance and participation in ethnic organizations were important for ethnic identity since the Church was involved in the struggle for statehood, and organizations were vehicles for promoting

ethnic interests. The emotional bond and sensitivity to happenings in the Ukraine continued to be strong for each individual, hence the term personal-affective for the mode of expression.

Second generation identity was symbolic, for immigrant children learned about their ethnic heritage and their ancestors secondarily and through the reminiscences of their parents. Generalized ideas about the Ukraine were entertained, and the Ukrainian national values of their parents were not difficult to relate to because they were symbolic of their parents' attempts to recreate a new life in Canada. Because the second generation was raised in a bilingual and bicultural atmosphere, many aspects of parental ethnicity were dysfunctional--Ukrainian was used less because English was more efficient; "old" Ukrainians with their outmoded habits and regional dialects were not language models because they were so different; parental experience with other Slavic languages had no influence on their attitudes towards the family of Slavic languages; mixed marriages were no longer a threat; church and organizational participation were less frequent. The Church, however, continued to be a symbol of the Ukrainian nationalist struggle inasmuch as respondents attended to demonstrate their support of the ethnic group more than out of religious conviction. Ethnic orientation was symbolic-affective.

Third generation ethnic identity was functional in that it had a utilitarian purpose. The experience of the third generation was entirely Canadian for they were raised by Canadian-born, not immigrant parents. As a result, strong emotional ties with the Ukraine were harder to sustain, and a more rational reason for retaining the heritage was in order for them. The solution was to relate it to a Canadian context by default, demonstrating practical, rather than old country emotional justifications

for the maintenance of ethnic traditions and customs. The native language was studied like another school subject that added another dimension to the personality, and aspects of the material culture were stressed because they were tangible and concrete. Having English as their native language was no longer conclusively linked to ethnic identity because Ukrainian was not as necessary for appreciating arts and crafts as much as for understanding the nationalistic values expounded by the ethnic press for first and second generation audiences. Ethnic orientation was cognitive-appreciative as the ethnic heritage was an object of study and interest.

In spite of the different orientations held by each generation, there are several themes, or end-products of the orientations that are common. The similarities involved are important ones where the second and third generations are concerned because they question the notion that assimilation follows over time. The second and third generations would like to see Ukrainian made available in public schools and retained in Saturday schools which fill the need for culture content classes; second and third generation children want to prolong their attendance at the Saturday school; a strong connection continues to be made between being of Ukrainian ancestry and retention of the native language; there is still a belief that Ukrainian continues to be spoken to a great degree in many homes; there is a reluctance to admit English into the Ukrainian language Mass. In contrast to theories of second generation alienation from the ethnic group, members exhibit a defensive pride in criticizing the emphasis given to French-language teaching at the expense of Ukrainian, and feel strongly about preserving the native language because it was the language of their forefathers.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

The results of this study have indicated that assimilation for the Ukrainian Orthodox group in the parish is not imminent for a number of reasons: generational differences have been demonstrated to be alternative methods of reacting to one's Ukrainian background, and largely dependent on the difficulty of transmitting immigrant ethnicity out of context. Furthermore, traditional assumptions concerning rising socio-economic status and educational level as reliable indicators of assimilation have been questioned. Instead, it has been demonstrated that the second generation does not seek to escape from its ethnic past, and the third, in fact, endeavours to recapture aspects of first generation immigrant ethnicity because it has never been in close contact with it. Inter-marriage was also discussed as constituting little actual threat to the perpetuation of the group, for the attitudes of children from mixed marriages resembled those of children from second generation Ukrainian marriages.

The key to the survival of the ethnic group is the third generation, whose native language (for children in the parish) is not Ukrainian for the first few years of life. However, the third generation is involved in a conscious effort to learn the rudiments of it in Ukrainian school. If past indicators are reliable, third generation Ukrainians may become confident speakers by adulthood, inasmuch as studies done on Ukrainian

have shown that the Canadian-born make up the greatest number of Ukrainians speaking Ukrainian. The difference between the percentage of the immigrant population and those reporting the corresponding mother tongue, measured in relation to the total population in a particular ethnic origin category "gives a general indication of the extent to which the native born contribute to language maintenance. This occurs to the greatest extent among the Ukrainians and the least among the Dutch" (Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book IV 1969: 120).

Furthermore, "the survival of a language is greatly affected by the support it receives at the lower age levels, especially in the 0-14 age bracket" (Ibid.: 121). For the Ukrainian group, the retention rate among the very young is 38.4%, significantly higher than for most other non-British and non-French groups, and greater than the German and the Dutch (Ibid.: 124).

Although the third generation in the parish understood far more Ukrainian than it spoke, the rationale for learning the language was predicated on a functional and rational base, in contrast to the emotional and sentimental reasons offered by parents and grandparents. The justification for language maintenance was one that relied on a Canadian context and was, by extension, easier to explain and defend. It was based on the argument of cognitive flexibility--that bilinguals were better, and that a second language broadened the mind. It was not a particularly Ukrainian fabrication, but an idea that had been substantiated by research into bilinguals in general (Nadia Rudyk reporting on a campus conference in The Gateway 1973: October 16). Because language maintenance has been defined in terms of a meaningful Canadian context, it seems increasingly likely that the rationale will continue to be functional for some time,

particularly in view of the flurry of interest generated by the government's multicultural programme. Inasmuch as the third generation is the first one to base its ethnicity on an exclusively Canadian foundation, such a step suggests that a plateau for future generations to follow has been attained, for they will be Canadian-born as well. Although no fourth generation Ukrainians belonged to the parish and the phenomenon could not be investigated in greater detail, other ethnic groups such as Doukhobor Russians (Vanek and Darnell 1971) and American Jews (Rosenthal 1965) have conclusively shown that the fourth generation is capable of perpetuating the ethnic heritage. Three fourth generation children from the south-side parish were, however, observed in a Ukrainian pre-school where they were being exposed to the rudiments of Ukrainian language and culture.[1] Two of the fourth generation children were observed over a period of three years and were subsequently enrolled in Ukrainian school and Ukrainian dancing classes.[2] They invariably addressed their grandmothers by the Ukrainian term, were familiar with typically Ukrainian foods and the festive preparations involved in Ukrainian Christmas and Easter, and did Easter-egg painting and embroidery. Their parents also stressed the "benefits" inherent in learning a second language, hence the children were growing up with a favourable attitude towards Ukrainian. Playmates were also of Ukrainian ancestry. Inasmuch as both children were adopted and knew it, their behavior attested to both their parents' and their own interest in the heritage.

Although present grants available through the government's multi-

---

[1] Participant-observation in a class taught by P. S., 1973.

[2] Observations in the home of Cathy and Caroline F., 1972-75.

cultural programme can be made to ethnic organizations that do not fall directly under religious auspices, the Ukrainian Orthodox parish is one of the keystones of Ukrainian (Orthodox) identity. The Church is not only the symbol of the struggle for statehood in the Ukraine, but also the vehicle for early consolidation of Ukrainian efforts to retain their heritage in Canada. In a modern context, the parish and the ethnic community are synonymous. Results in the study have suggested that the religious function of the parish may be less important than the promotion of ethnic solidarity, for the Church not only sponsors Ukrainian school classes on Saturdays, but its members attend less out of religious obligation than to reaffirm their connection with the ethnic group. It was the substitution of English for Ukrainian in a Mass that caused a decrease in church attendance in a Minneapolis church, not changes in dogma or ritual. Similarly, respondents were more concerned with marrying a person of non-Ukrainian ancestry than one not of the faith, and there was reluctance to admit English into the Ukrainian language Mass as well. Furthermore, there is increasing evidence to suggest that the parish priest, as the representative of the Church, has an important role in formulating policies that directly influence the affairs of the Ukrainian community rather than the immediate affairs of the religious group. In some parishes this may take the form of suggesting which candidate would represent Ukrainian interests best at election time (Darnell and Vanek 1974: 82), to organizing a boycott of Soviet performers appearing at the Jubilee Auditorium in the city (Edmonton Journal, November 7, 1974: 63). The traditional association between the Church and maintenance of Ukrainian identity has been reaffirmed in this study as well. The present cooperation of the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox groups in the establishment

of joint language instruction programmes indicates that both churches fulfill parallel roles in the perpetuation of the heritage.

Currently, Ukrainian language instruction in public schools is coming increasingly into vogue. The traditional religious differences between Ukrainian Catholics and Ukrainian Orthodox believers have diminished since the animosity of the early years of Ukrainian immigration, and the two groups are working in unison to establish Ukrainian kindergarten classes throughout the city. In 1974, complete accredited kindergarten instruction in Ukrainian was implemented at Granview Heights, St. Mathews, Clara Tanner, Princeton, and Woodcroft schools. Except for one child out of a dozen in the Woodcroft school, none understood very much Ukrainian, and most children were drawn from third and fourth generation ranks as well as mixed marriages. Instruction was more in Ukrainian than in English, and featured all the activities of a normal kindergarten.[3] Plans were also underway to expand the programme well into the other elementary grades.

The growing implementation of Ukrainian language instruction in public schools will have a beneficial psychological effect on third generation children who are growing up in an atmosphere where public school instruction in the native language is gradually becoming taken for granted as part of the Edmonton curriculum, and therefore in keeping with Canadian society. Such a development will reinforce third generation ethnicity to the point where speaking Ukrainian and learning about the ethnic heritage will be more integral and commonplace aspects of Canadian life than they

---

[3] Participant-observation at Woodcroft School in the class of Mrs. T., 1973.

are currently. The effect is slowly beginning to take shape as illustrated in a 1974 programme on the children's television show Popcorn Playhouse featuring an interview between CFRN television personality "Tiger" Goldstick and a local Ukrainian instructor in a public school. During the course of the conversation it was revealed that children from the Ukrainian class were unintentionally greeting non-Ukrainian playmates in Ukrainian while the latter were dropping by the classes to see what was happening. This is the first step in achieving a multicultural and multilingual society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barth, Fredrik. Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1969.

Bender, Eugene and Kagiwada, George. Hansen's Law of Third Generation Return and the Study of American Religio-Ethnic Groups. Phylon, Winter: 360-370, 1968.

Bilotserkivets, N. Pro Holosy Scho Vnosyat Nespokij. Promin, Ukrainian Women's Association of Canada. June 1-2, 1970.

Blalock, Hubert M. Social Statistics. McGraw-Hill Book Company Inc., New York, 1960.

Bociurkiw, Bohdan R. Ethnic Identification and Attitudes of University Students of Ukrainian Descent: The University of Alberta Case Study. Slavs in Canada III: 15-110, 1969.

Bozhyk, P. Istoriia Ukrains'koi Emihratsii v Kanadi 1890-1930. The People's Press, Winnipeg, 1930.

Chumer, W. Spomyny, Edmonton, 1942.

Darnell, Regna and Vanek, Anthony L. Some Notes on Methodology in Language Research. The Western Canadian Journal of Anthropology, Vol. IV, No. 2: 77-85, 1974.

Darroch, A. Gordon and Marston, Wilfred G. The Social Class Basis of Ethnic Residential Segregation in the Canadian Case. American Journal of Sociology 77: 491-510, 1972.

Edmonton Journal. Clerics support boycott of Soviet singers. Edmonton, Alberta. November 7: 63, Thursday, 1974.

Elliott, Jean Leonard. Minority Groups: A Canadian Perspective. Immigrant Groups: Jean Leonard Elliott, ed. Prentice-Hall, Scarborough, 1-14, 1971.

Emanuel, Lydia. Some Aspects of Ethnic Identity in a Ukrainian Orthodox Parish. The Western Canadian Journal of Anthropology, Vol. IV, No. 2: 87-96, 1974.

Ewach, Honore. The Ukraine's Famous Wandering Philosopher. Promin. The Ukrainian Women's Association of Canada, August-September: 15, 1972.

Fishman, Joshua A. and Nahirny, Vladimir C. The Ethnic Group School and Mother Tongue Maintenance. Language Loyalty in the United States, Joshua A. Fishman, ed. Mouton, The Hague: 92-126, 1966.

Flak, Nicholas. The Oldest Ukrainian Settlement in Canada. Ukrainian Pioneers of Alberta, J. Lazarenko, ed. Alberta Printing: 13-19, 1970.

Flanagan, Thomas. Ethnic Voting in Alberta Provincial Elections 1921-1971. Canadian Ethnic Studies, University of Calgary 3: 139-164, 1971.

Goffman, Erving. The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Doubleday and Company Inc., Garden City, New York, 1959.

Gordon, Milton M. Assimilation in American Life. Oxford University Press, New York, 1964.

Gregorovich, Andrew. Canadian Ethnic Groups Bibliography. Ontario Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship, Toronto, 1972.

Hansen, M. L. The Third Generation in America. Commentary XIV, No. 5: 492-500, 1952.

Hedley, Max. Acculturation Studies of North American Indians: A Critique of the Underlying Framework and its Implications. Unpublished M. A. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1971.

Hobart, Charles W. Adjustment of Ukrainians in Alberta: Alienation and Integration. Slavs in Canada I: 69-87, 1966.

Hofman, John E. Mother Tongue Retention in Ethnic Parishes. Language Loyalty in the United States, Joshua A. Fishman, ed. Mouton, The Hague: 127-155, 1966.

Hrushevsky, Michael. A History of Ukraine. Yale University Press, New Haven, 1943.

Kaye, Vladimir J. Early Ukrainian Settlements in Canada 1895-1900. University of Toronto Press, 1964.

_____. Three Phases of Ukrainian Immigration. Slavs in Canada I: 36-43, 1966.

Kellner, P. J. Canadian Slavs Through the Mirror of Their Press. Slavs in Canada I: 148-153, 1966.

Klymasz, Robert B. An Introduction to the Ukrainian-Canadian Folksong Cycle. National Museums of Canada, Ottawa, 1970.

_____. Continuity and Change: The Ukrainian Folk Heritage in Canada. Canadian Centre for Folk Culture Studies, National Museum of Man., Ottawa, 1972.

Kostiuk, Hryhory. Stalinist Rule in the Ukraine. Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1960.

Krypiakevych, Ivan. Istoria Ukrainy. Ukrainian-American Congress Committee, New York, 1961.

Kurdydyk, Antole. Lyoobov do Krasy. Promin, Natalia Kohuska, ed. Ukrainian Women's Association of Canada, February: 14, 1973.

Lai, Vivien. The New Chinese Immigrants in Toronto. Immigrant Groups, Jean Leonard Elliott, ed., Prentice Hall, Scarborough: 120-140, 1971.

Lambert, W. E. and Tucker, G. R. Bilingual Education of Children, The St. Lambert Experiment. Newbury House Publishers Inc., Rowley, Massachusetts, 1972.

Lambert, Wallace E. et al. An Innovative Approach to Second Language Learning: The St. Lambert Experiment. Bilingualism, Biculturalism and Education, S. T. Carey, ed., University of Alberta, 1974.

Lupul, Manoly R. A Just Language Policy in a "Just Society." Promin. Ukrainian Women's Association of Canada, October: 15-17, 1971.

Macnamara, John. The Generalizability of Results of Studies of Bilingual Education. Bilingualism, Biculturalism and Education, S. T. Carey, ed., University of Alberta: 95-98, 1974.

Martowych, Oleh. Ukrainian Liberation Movement in Modern Times. Today's World Handbooks of Current World Affairs. Scottish League for European Freedom, Edinburgh, 1952.

Marunchak, M. H. Istoriia Ukraintsiv Kanady. Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences in Canada, Winnipeg, 1968.

Maslanyk, A. and Chomiak, M. The Scientific Contribution of Ukrainians to the Industrial Development of Canada. Slavs in Canada II: 178-188, 1967.

Millet, David. The Orthodox Church: Ukrainian, Greek and Syrian. Immigrant Groups, Jean Leonard Elliot, ed., 1971.

Moerman, Michael. Ethnic Identification in a Complex Civilization: Who are the Lue? American Anthropologist 67: 1215-1230, 1965.

Nahirny, Vladimir C. and Fishman, Joshua A. Ukrainian Language Maintenance Efforts in the United States. Language Loyalty in the United States, Joshua A. Fishman, ed., Mouton, The Hague: 318-357, 1966.

Palmer, Howard. Canada: Multicultural or Bicultural? Canadian Ethnic Studies, Vol. III, No. 1. The University of Calgary: 109-118, 1971.

_____. Land of the Second Chance. Lethbridge Herald, Lethbridge, Alberta, 1972.

Pobihushchy, Sidney I. The Development of Political Socialization of Ukrainians in Alberta. Slavs in Canada II: 20-30, 1967.

Pohorecky, Zenon S. and Royick, Alexander. Anglicization of Ukrainian in Canada Between 1895 and 1970: A Case Study of Linguistic Crystallization. Canadian Ethnic Studies, University of Calgary I: 141-219, 1969.

Porter, John. The Vertical Mosaic. University of Toronto Press, Ontario, 1973.

Prokop, D. Characteristics of Ukrainian Pioneers. The Ukrainian Pioneers in Alberta, Canada, Joseph M. Lazarenko, ed. Alberta Printing Company, Edmonton: 24-27, 1970.

Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Preliminary Report. Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1965.

_____. The Cultural Contribution of the Other Ethnic Groups. Book IV. Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1969.

Rosenthal, Erich. Acculturation Without Assimilation? The Jewish Community of Chicago, Illinois. Life in Society, Thomas E. Lasswell et al, eds. Scott, Foresman and Smith, Chicago: 266-273, 1965.

Rudnyckyj, Jaroslav B. Separate Statement. The Official Languages, Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism Book I. Queen's Printer, Ottawa, 1967.

_____. Communicating in a Multicultural Society. Canadian Languages in their Social Context, Regna Darnell, ed. Linguistic Research Inc., Edmonton: 117-128, 1973.

Rudyk, Nadia. Two languages are better than one. The Gateway, University of Alberta, October 16: 1, 1973.

Sarchuk, W. Ridna Shkola Yak Peredymova. Promin. The Ukrainian Women's Association of Canada, March: 9-11, 1972.

Seigel, Sidney. Non-parametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. McGraw-Hill. New York, 1956.

Selltiz, Claire et al. Research Methods in Social Relations. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1959.

Shevchenko, Taras. Rozryta Mohyla. Kobzar. Academy of Sciences, USSR: 185, 1958.

Slawuta, Sonia. Project on Bilingualism. Alberta Cultural Heritage Conference Briefs. Alberta Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation: 137-138, 1972.

Stearns, Anna. Canadian Slavs: Their Actual and Potential Role in Canada's Evolution. Slavs in Canada II: 51-55, 1967.

Trosky, Odarka S. The Ukrainian Greek Orthodox Church in Canada. Bulman Bros., Winnipeg, 1968.

Trident Press. History of Ukraine For Children of School Age. Winnipeg, Canada, 1966.

Tyler, Leona E. The Psychology of Human Differences. Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, 1965.

Ukrainian Professional and Businessmen's Club of Edmonton. For the Preservation and Development of the Ukrainian Culture and Heritage in Alberta. Alberta Cultural Heritage Conference Briefs, Supplement. Alberta Department of Culture Youth and Recreation, 1972.

Ukrainian Women's Association of Canada. Pro Holosy Scho Vnosyat Nespokij. Promin, Natalia Kohuska, ed., June, Winnipeg, 1970.

_____. Ridna Mova. Promin, Natalia Kohuska, ed., September, Winnipeg, 1973.

Vanek, A. L. and Darnell, R. A Doukhobor Russian Lexical and Dialectological Questionnaire. Linguistic Research Inc., Edmonton, 1971.

_____. Doukhobor Russian Language Maintenance. Advances in the Study of Societal Multilingualism, Joshua A. Fishman, ed., Mouton, The Hague, In Press.

Wallace, Anthony F. C. Culture and Personality. Random House, New York, 1964.

Wangenheim, E. D. The Ukrainians: A Case Study of the Third Force. Canada: A Sociological Profile, W. E. Mann, ed., Copp-Clark: 173-176, 1971.

Woolston, Howard. The Process of Assimilation. Life in Society, Thomas E. Lasswell, et al, eds., Scott, Foresman and Company, Chicago: 258-265, 1965.

Woycenko, O. The Ukrainians in Canada. Canada Ethnica IV. Ottawa. Canada Ethnic Press Federation and Centennial Commission, 1967.

Yastremskij, T. A. Kanadiianizatsiia. Winnipeg, 1943.

Young, Charles H. The Ukrainian Canadians. Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd. Toronto, 1931.

Yuzyk, Paul. The Ukrainians in Manitoba: A Social History. University of Toronto Press, 1953.

APPENDIX 1

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is your name?_____
2. Where do you live?_____
3. What is your telephone number?_____
4. What is your place of birth?_____
5. What is your length of residence in Canada?_____
6. How long have you lived in Edmonton?_____
7. If you immigrated to Canada, how old were you when you arrived?_____
8. From what country did you immigrate?_____
9. What is your father's place of birth?_____
10. What is your mother's place of birth?_____
11. What education have you had?_____
12. What is your occupation?_____
13. What education has your father had?_____
14. What is your father's occupation?_____
15. What education has your mother had?_____
16. What is your mother's occupation?_____
17. Do you have any sisters or brothers? How many?_____
18. Can you give me their ages?_____
19. What is your religion?_____
20. What is your father's religion?_____
21. What is your mother's religion?_____
22. What is your spouse's length of residence in Canada?_____
23. What is your spouse's length of residence in Edmonton?_____
24. If your spouse immigrated, what was his/her age then?_____
25. From what country did your spouse immigrate?_____
26. Whad education has your spouse had?_____

27. What is the occupation of your spouse?_____

28. What is the religion of your spouse?_____

29. Do you belong to this parish?_____

30. How long have you belonged here?_____

31. Did you ever attend some other parish in the city?_____

32. What is your native language?_____

33. What is your ethnic origin?_____

34. What language did you first speak?_____

35. Can you still understand it?_____

36. What language(s) do you speak at home?_____

37. Which language do you use the most at home? When?_____

_____

38. On what occasions do you use the other language?_____

_____

39. Which language was hardest for you to learn?_____

40. Is it easier to learn Ukrainian if you are of Ukrainian ancestry?

_____

41. Do old people speak Ukrainian better?_____

42. Do young people speak as well as their parents?_____

43. Do some people understand who don't speak?_____

44. Do many children learn only Ukrainian at home?_____

45. Are many preschool children bilingual in English and Ukrainian?_____

_____

46. From what individual did you learn the most about Ukrainian?_____

_____

47. What should parents do to encourage their children to learn Ukrainian?

_____

48. Do you speak any other languages besides Ukrainian?_____

_____

49. Do you understand any other languages?_____

50. In addition to English, which we have to pretty well learn here in the schools of Edmonton, what other languages do you think should be taught?_____

51. Do you feel you have the same problems as other immigrant groups?

_____

52. Do you feel it is good to learn Ukrainian? Why?_____

_____

53. Could you name three of your best friends for me?_____

_____

54. Could you name three people you think speak Ukrainian really well?

_____

55. Would you take Ukrainian if it was offered in public schools?_____

_____

56. Would you encourage your children to take it?_____

57. Do you think the Church should continue sponsoring Ukrainian schools even though public schools would offer it?_____

_____

58. Did you ever attend Ukrainian school?_____

59. What was the language of instruction, by and large?_____

_____

60. Is Ukrainian the only subject you should learn there?_____

_____

61. Do you speak Ukrainian at recess?_____

62. Do you put on any concerts, plays?_____

63. To what extent do you participate in these?_____

64. How long have you attended Ukrainian school?_____

65. Should the government assist Ukrainian schools?_____

66. How much longer would you like to attend Ukrainian school?_____

_____

67. Do you read any books in Ukrainian on your own?_____

68. Do you know any stories in Ukrainian?_____

69. Would you consider giving any of your pets a Ukrainian name?_____

70. If you had a choice of visiting several places in the world, would you consider going to the Ukraine? Why?_____

_____

71. Should the priest work harder at encouraging the people to send their children to Ukrainian school?_____

72. How often do you attend church?_____

73. How well do you feel you understand the service?_____

74. Do you follow the service with a prayer book?_____

75. In what language(s) is the prayer book?_____

76. What can people do who don't understand it?_____

77. How do you feel about Ukrainian-English prayer books?_____

_____

78. What prayers do you know by heart in Ukrainian?_____

_____

79. Do you say prayers at home?_____

80. How long did you go to Sunday school?_____

81. In what language were you taught?_____

82. How do you feel about having church services in English?_____

_____

83. Were any of your Sunday school classes taught in Ukrainian or English only?_____

84. In what language were the Sunday school books?_____

85. Which language do you feel it would be easiest to learn in?_____

_____

86. Should Sunday school books be bilingual?_____

87. Do you celebrate Ukrainian Christmas and Easter? Any other religious days?_____

88. Have you gone to Ukrainian summer camp?_____

89. How do you feel about marrying someone not of Ukrainian ancestry?

_____

90. How do you feel about marrying someone who is not Orthodox?_____

_____

91. What do you think would happen if you married someone who was not Ukrainian and not Orthodox with regard to your participation in this church?_____

92. Do you belong to any organizations sponsored by the Church?_____

_____

93. How long have you been a member?_____

94. How often do you go to Ukrainian weddings?_____

95. What language is mainly spoken by the Ukrainian organizations you belong to?_____

96. Do you subscribe to any Ukrainian publications?_____

97. How often do you attend Sunday school?_____

98. Do you think the priest should work harder to encourage people to attend church and church activities?_____

APPENDIX 2

DETERMINATION OF THE ETHNIC SCORE

Inasmuch as quantitative data and research done on Ukrainians in Canada amounts to very little, the rationale for scoring various responses must be partly based on intuition and on my own observations and membership in the Ukrainian community. Furthermore, the vehemence and expression with which responses were given, cannot be communicated with the same accuracy and feeling on paper, so that the decision for scoring one reponse higher than another reflects this problem. A large proportion of the questions that were used are language related, as many Ukrainian-Canadians assume that speaking the language is the cornerstone of Ukrainian identity. Having Ukrainian as the native language, however, does not necessarily preclude an individual from responding to all language-related items in a similar fashion, hence questions which may appear to be redundant at first glance are not necessarily tapping the same information.

Responses were weighted so that the most dogmatic attitude with respect to yielding up one's identity and heritage received a score of three points in each case. The determination of what constituted the most dogmatic response was arrived at after perusal of various ethnic publications and attendance at numerous ethnic functions where the strategy for maintaining the Ukrainian heritage was voiced in strong terms. In most cases, the rationale is self-evident. Certain responses were grouped around issues which seemed to indicate fine nuances of opinion. These were retained even in cases where there seemed to be as many as six categories of opinion, which were, nevertheless, weighted to correspond to the maximum of three points for the most dogmatic reply.

Question 35: This question was designed to arrive at some indication of the level of comprehension of Ukrainian, and the amount that it was spoken. Respondents were asked to describe how well they felt they spoke

it; where children were concerned, their grade in Ukrainian school was taken into account, the help of the teacher was solicited, and their proficiency was determined along with participant-observation. It was felt to be an important question for compiling the ethnic score because of the very traditional assumption that only those who understand the language well are able to participate in other spheres of ethnic life. Those who comprehend little, then, would not be expected to participate in the various spheres of ethnic life and would not be as concerned about maintaining the ethnic heritage. Such respondents might be expected to have a low over-all ethnic score (within the scope of this study). Nevertheless, where the native language of the individual is not Ukrainian but the individual comprehends a good amount of the language and is attending Ukrainian school to improve his command of it, it is felt that this may be indicative of an attitude towards preservation of the heritage. It is possible that responses and attitudes will vary from question to question so that the resulting score of an individual who comprehends little of the language could be high or low, and therefore not contingent upon ability to understand the language at all. It is because of this possibility that comprehension is treated in this question as a dependent variable, and, depending upon the individual's ethnic score and the outcome of hypotheses concerning differences between high and low ethnic scores, the validity of traditional assumptions concerning high and low scores can be examined.

Five responses were considered for this item:

(3.0) - very well
(2.4) - well
(1.8) - fairly well (understands most of what is said)
(1.2) - not well (misses a considerable amount)
(0.6) - hardly anything

Question 36: There were three possible choices in this question:

(3.0) - Ukrainian
(2.0) - Both English and Ukrainian
(1.0) - English

Question 36 was felt to be important for compiling ethnic score because the reply to Question 36 could not necessarily be anticipated from the individual's response to the previous question. An individual who understood the language very well did not necessarily use it or speak it at home suggesting something about the attitude of the person towards the heritage.

Question 37: Responses to this question were scored on the basis of how much Ukrainian was used because of the traditional assumptions concerning the compartmentalization of the heritage and the implications of not "living ethnically."

(3.0) - Ukrainian used all of the time, including siblings
(2.5) - Ukrainian used to speak to parents
(2.0) - Ukrainian used to speak to grandparents
(1.5) - occasionally to "old people" (who are not relatives)
(1.0) - Ukrainian school or "never"

Those who stated that they spoke Ukrainian almost all of the time received the highest score, for this would, presumably, reflect a strong committment to maintain the heritage. Those who said they spoke Ukrainian to their parents received a score of 2.5, inasmuch as the large majority of first generation parents understood some English. Speaking Ukrainian to such parents was not an absolute necessity, and would, therefore, indicate a commitment. In instances where the parents knew no English, speaking Ukrainian to them would be a necessity, and so speaking Ukrainian to parents received a lower score than speaking Ukrainian "all of the time" and to everyone. Children who spoke Ukrainian to their grandparents only, usually saw their grandparents infrequently, so that speaking Ukrainian was

not part of their daily routine. Grandparents usually were not adept at English, and speaking Ukrainian to them was more of a necessity than a choice. Consequently, persons who stated that they used Ukrainian only to speak to their grandparents received a score of 2.0. Where grandparents understood English, or where there were none, chances would be that the individual might only use Ukrainian to address the very old such as in church or on extremely rare occasions. Responses fitting into this category received a score of 1.5. Responses that indicated that a person used Ukrainian on "special occasions" (such as at Christmas or Easter, or to "show-off" in front of relatives) received a score of 1.0 because such behaviour would be rarer, and in some instances, ritualized, so that little on-going ethnicity would be involved. Those who replied that they never used Ukrainian or that they used it when absolutely forced to (in Ukrainian school) received the lowest score of all. This question was designed to pinpoint the areas where Ukrainian was used, for the traditional assumption has been that the unconcerned (low ethnic-scoring) Ukrainian is the one who uses the native language on rare occasions, and exhibits an uncaring attitude towards the heritage in general.

Question 47: Responses reflected a range of opinion, reflecting six categories of thought:

(3.0) - teach the language at home, send to Ukrainian school, Ukrainian summer camp, etc. (combination assault)
(2.5) - "Talk it at home"
(2.0) - List the advantages of learning Ukrainian
(1.5) - Force them to learn it
(1.0) - "No idea, but . . ."
(0.5) - Send them to school (and let the school worry about it)

The response to receive the highest score was one that stressed an overall exposure to the ethnic heritage. The attitude that it was sufficient

to speak the language at home was felt to be insufficient, since the important element of parental and institutional involvement (i.e. exposure to the rest of the ethnic community) was missing. While listing the material advantages of learning the language was good, it was felt to be less ethnic in that allegiance to one's heritage had to be rationalized and an excuse for maintaining it had to be found. Frequently, it was seen to be a way of obtaining personal gain, rather than reflecting an open commitment to the culture of one's ancestors. Forcing a child to learn Ukrainian received 1.5 points, for although it was still a motivator, it was a negative one, and might conceivably have the effect of creating resentment and alienation. A reply of "I don't know, but . . ." indicated uncertainty and was still hopeful that a solution of some kind might be found. Sending children off to Ukrainian school was given the fewest points, for it removed the traditional obligation from the parents and placed the burden on other shoulders. Individuals whose responses fell in this category did not seem to be interested in involving themselves in the education of their children at all.

Question 52: Responses were placed in the following catories:

(3.0) - The language is part of the heritage; it is as good as any other language;
(2.5) - It is good to know a second language
(2.0) - It is good to speak it with people who don't understand English
(1.5) - It's just nice . . .
(1.0) - It's something to fill your time . . .
(0.5) - It's useless.

Again, the response to receive the highest score reflected an obligation to preserve the language and a pride in it. Individuals who stated that it was good to know a second language were given 2.5 points, for it was felt that this might have represented a rationalization for maintaining

the heritage and perhaps a reluctance to admit allegiance to the group. Persons who felt that Ukrainian was useful only to speak with other people who did not understand English would obviously find little reason to learn it at all if there were few non-English speakers left. Those who felt quite neutral about it received 1.5 points, followed by replies that suggested that learning the language was a temporary diversion. Those who seemed to feel hostile towards the alleged cornerstone of Ukrainian identity received the lowest score.

Question 53: This question was designed to arrive at a measure of the individual's closeness to the ethnic community.

The ideal which the Orthodox Church strives to promote, is to have its members form friendships with those of their own ethnic group, in the hopes that it will heighten ethnic awareness and lead to marriage within the group. Having friends of Ukrainian ancestry would be one aspect of a strong Ukrainian identity.

(3.0) - all my friends
(2.25)- most of my friends
(1.50)- a few of my friends
(0.75)- none of my friends

Question 54: It was felt that an awareness of who the leaders in the ethnic community were, would be an indicator of the kind of solidarity with the group that the individual felt. The question was phrased in terms of who the respondent identified with as a model of all that typified being a "good" Ukrainian--i.e. speaking the language very well. Ideally, the priest, and heads of ethnic organizations are expected to set an example for other members in the community to follow. In cases where the individual was a very active member in the community himself, there might

not be any models.

(3.0) - No models; the individual speaks Ukrainian very well and is very active in the Ukrainian community
(2.5) - Priest, leaders of organizations, Ukrainian school teachers
(2.0) - Relatives (where the individual spoke Ukrainian poorly, and did not recognize that relatives were not much better)
(1.5) - Old people--the individual felt that younger people did not know very much at all and had no contemporary models
(1.0) - Friends at Ukrainian school (where this was the only place Ukrainian was heard and the models spoke it very poorly; for adults, the equivalent was friends in church organizations)
(0.5) - No models--the individual speaks poorly, and does not know who speaks well either

It was assumed that persons who participated in ethnic life to a minimal extent would not have any models and would score low. Low scores in this question would traditionally be expected to be reflected in low scores throughout.

Question 55: This question was only answered by children. Children who would agree to take Ukrainian in public school would be expressing a desire to maintain their heritage publicly, suggesting a strong pride in their culture.

(3.0) - Yes
(2.0) - Maybe
(1.0) - Never

Question 56: This question was answered by adults. Adults who would encourage their children to take Ukrainian in public school would also be expressing a desire to maintain their heritage publicly, suggesting a strong pride in the culture, and a high ethnic score.

(3.0) - Yes
(2.0) - Maybe
(1.0) - No

Question 57: In this case, the top score was given to persons who wanted their children to attend Ukrainian classes in public school, and also

retain the Saturday classes as well. Individuals who recognized that the Saturday classes provided information in addition to simply teaching grammar (as would be the case in public school) were felt to be those who cared about maintaining the ethnic heritage in toto. The ethnic school caters especially to children of elementary school age, and would also be ideal for children too young to learn Ukrainian in public school.

(3.0) - Yes
(2.0) - Maybe
(1.0) - No

Question 60: Scores were allotted on the basis of three possible responses. The question was aimed at getting indirectly at interest in enculturation through the medium of song and dance, history, and geography that are offered at the Saturday school. Children also spend much time preparing for annual concerts honouring Ukrainian nationalist heroes, and major Ukrainian religious celebrations. Those who felt that these should be retained would be indicating support for ancestral traditions and would have the highest scores.

(3.0) - No
(2.0) - Maybe
(1.0) - Yes

Question 61: Children who spoke Ukrainian to their classmates during recess time would be using the language as the school intended--i.e. a vehicle of communication, rather than a subject of study. As long as the language was never carried beyond the classroom it could not be associated with daily life, and could never be an important aspect of the heritage. Children who had a strong sense of ethnic identity would be expected to use the language outside the classroom.

(3.0) - Yes, quite frequently
(2.0) - Sometimes
(1.0) - Never

Question 63: Children were asked to describe the nature of their participation and experience in concerts and plays honouring various nationalist heroes and celebrating major Ukrainian religious holidays. Although it is recognized that not all children are talented, the situation in Ukrainian school is usually such that everyone likes to do something. Children who do not participate and feel that the entire exercise is a waste of time frequently do not appreciate the significance of the concert, and would not, therefore, be expected to have high ethnic scores.

(3.0) - Active; solo recitations, plays, singing, dancing
(2.0) - More passive roles; singing in unison (activity is perceived to be boring, but tolerable
(1.0) - dislikes participation of any kind

Question 65: The intent of this question was to measure whether or not preservation of the heritage was something that the group wanted to sustain on its own and in addition to the ways of the larger society, or whether or not the group felt that the promotion of multiculturalism was the obligation of the whole society. Those who would be strongly in favour of a culturally plural stance would be expected to have high scores throughout.

(3.0) - Yes
(2.0) - Perhaps
(1.0) - No

Question 66: This question was intended to see whether or not the child was being forced to attend Ukrainian school, and disliked it, or felt that he was working towards a definite goal, and appreciated his heritage. Children who were hostile about attending might be resentful and alien-

ated from their heritage and would be expected to have low scores.

(3.0) - Until I learn enough (complete all of the grades)
(2.0) - I don't know
(1.0) - The less, the better

Question 67: Reading books in Ukrainian or else about Ukrainians was felt to be an indicator of involvement with ethnicity inasmuch as the reader was interested in finding out more information about his background. Those who read in Ukrainian or else about Ukrainians on their own would be expected to have high ethnic scores.

(3.0) - Often
(2.25)- Now and then
(1.5) - Would like to, but never get around to it
(0.75)- Can't be bothered

Question 70: Individuals were asked whether or not they would consider visiting the Ukraine if they had a choice of visiting five places in the world. The question was intended to measure the degree of closeness to the Ukraine that individuals felt. Those who identified very closely with the Ukraine would be expected to have high scores.

(3.0) - No, because of the politics! This response was given the highest score because individuals in this category explained that they had left the Ukraine for political and cultural reasons and could never return for fear of reprisal. They still felt keenly about being of Ukrainian ancestry and voiced strong opinions about the "Communists."
(2.5) - Yes, because it is the land of our ancestors. The individual was very interested in seeing where his family originated from and appreciative of the culture, although not as fiercely patriotic.
(2.0) - Yes, to see how the people over there live--this response was ranked lower, because there seemed to be no real link with the people in any sense.
(1.5) - Yes, I like travelling. This response expressed a very generalized interest in seeing new places, and showed no real feeling for the connection with the past. The individual was still interested.
(1.0) - Maybe . . . I think I'd rather see Hawaii. This response was scored lower than the previous one because it showed a limited interest.
(0.5) - No. Respondents explained that it was dirty and foreign and seemed embarassed about the topic.

Question 71 and 98: Traditionally, the priest has been the major force in the parish and his duty is to be an effective organizer and campaigner for ethnic interests. It was felt that those who felt that the priest should continue to be a strong advocate of ethnic interests would have high scores, while those who were not interested in putting forward the group's interests would have low scores.

(3.0) - Yes, it is his duty to provide an example
(2.25)- He can't influence people, but he can try. (Here, the attitude was still positive).
(1.5) - It's up to him to do as he pleases (implying that he should not expect any support)
(0.75)- He overdoes it already.

Question 76: Here, responses emphasizing that it was up to the individual to ask and learn about the heritage were awarded the highest scores.

(3.0) - Learn Ukrainian and ask about it
(2.4) - Use the bilingual prayer book to explain parts
(1.8) - Read it all in English
(1.2) - I suppose something would have to be done . . .
(0.6) - You'll just have to live with it.

Question 78: Since children in Sunday School and Ukrainian School are taught that certain activities must begin and end with a prayer (in Ukrainian), this question was intended to determine how much of this aspect of traditional teaching is actually carried over into daily life. Children memorize the syllables of the words in prayers where facility in Ukrainian is limited, so that saying prayers at home is not actually dependent on the ability to speak Ukrainian.

(3.0) - Quite a few
(2.0) - Very few
(1.0) - None at all

Question 82: There is currently a debate in some parishes over the implementation of English language Masses. Those who oppose it feel that it is

a giant step towards assimilation and betrayal of the heritage. The Church does not support the implementation of English.

(3.0) - Not at all! Would never stand for it!
(2.4) - There are enough English-Ukrainian prayer books that something could be worked out to keep the Ukrainian (Although this response shows some willingness to compromise, the desire to preserve Ukrainian is still there)
(1.8) - Half-and-half might be nice (Indicates a greater compromise)
(1.2) - It makes no difference to me
(0.6) - Get rid of the Ukrainian altogether

Question 87: It was felt that persons who celebrated Ukrainian Christmas and Easter would be preserving the traditions and so they received high ethnic scores.

(3.0) - Yes
(1.5) - No

Question 88: It was felt that those who sent their children to Ukrainian summer camp or those who attended Ukrainian summer camp should be those with high ethnic scores for they would be acting in accordance with the position of the Church. The Church stresses that at summer camp children obtain an enriched education where the heritage is concerned, improve their ability to speak Ukrainian, and form friendships with those of their own group.

(3.0) - Yes
(1.5) - No

Question 89 and 90: Marriage out of the group is not condoned by the Church or by those who are strongly nationalistic. It was felt that those with the lowest scores would be those who felt that out-marriage would pose no threat to the solidarity of the group.

(3.0) - Would not consider marrying an "outsider" at all
(2.25)- Might consider it if the other person "converted"
(1.5) - Neutral, will compromise
(0.75)- Would not hesitate

Question 92 and 96: It was expected that high-scoring individuals would subscribe to numerous ethnic publications and be involved in ethnic organizations.

(3.0) - Several
(2.0) - One
(1.0) - None

NOTES:

1. There is no zero point for ethnic score on any of the scales, as one of the main points of the study is that everyone has an ethnic score.

2. Since the most frequent range for a reply encompassed three categories of response, it was felt to be less complicated to weight responses with a range of five, for example, in terms of the more common range of three: hence, the small variations from .5 to 1.5 on the lowest categories. For purposes of this study, however, such variations were not felt to be of sufficient magnitude to prevent separation of the population into the two classes of high or low scorers. The median for adult scores was 56.2 while the range was from 78.2-37.2. For children, the median was 52.05, while the range was from 75.6-34.05

APPENDIX 3

CONTINGENCY TABLES

TABLE 1

H_0 = There is no difference between first generation and second generation (adult) ethnic scores.
H_1 = First generation adults have higher ethnic scores than second generation adults.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
FIRST GENERATION ADULTS	13(8.0)	3(8.0)	18
SECOND GENERATION ADULTS	8(13.0)	18(13.0)	26
TOTAL	21	21	42

$x^2 = 8.18$

significant at .01 level

NOTES:

The figures in brackets are expected frequencies.

The Correction for Continuity (Blalock 1960: 221) was used whenever the expected frequency in any cell fell below 10. The corrected observed frequency is not listed, but may be computed by either adding or subtracting .5 from the observed frequency in each cell.

Results at the .05 level of significance or better were used to indicate significant differences.

The Formula to compute chi-square was - $x^2 = \sum \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$

TABLE 2

H_0 = There is no difference between second generation and third generation children's ethnic scores.
H_1 = Second generation children have higher ethnic scores than third generation children.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
SECOND GENERATION CHILDREN	10(6.77)	4(7.23)	14
THIRD GENERATION CHILDREN	5(8.23)	12(8.77)	17
TOTAL	15	16	31

$x^2 = 3.89$

significant at .05 level

TABLE 3

H_0 = There is no difference in ethnic scores between immigrants who arrived at an early age and immigrants who arrived when they were older.

H_1 = Immigrants who arrived at an early age have lower ethnic scores.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
LATE IMMIGRATORS	2(2.44)	11(10.56)	13
EARLY IMMIGRATORS	1(.56)	2(2.44)	3
TOTAL	3	13	16

Not significant at .05 level.

NOTE:

Fisher's Exact Test (Siegel 1956: 99) was used whenever the total population was less than or equal to thirty. The data has been recast in order to permit usage of the Fisher-Yates Test of Significance in 2 x 2 Contingency Tables (Ibid.: 256) as per instructions for their use. The Tables do not provide exact probabilities, only levels of significance.

TABLE 4

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of children whose parents immigrated at an early age and children whose parents immigrated at an older age.

H_1 = Children of immigrants who arrived at a later age have higher ethnic scores.

	Ethnicity		
	Low Scores	High Scores	Total
CHILDREN OF LATE IMMIGRATORS	3(4.94)	9(7.06)	12
CHILDREN OF EARLY IMMIGRATORS	4(2.06)	1(2.94)	5
TOTAL	7	10	17

Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 5

H_0 = There is no difference in ethnic scores between first generation males and second generation males.
H_1 = First generation males have higher ethnic scores than second generation males.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
SECOND GENERATION MALES	3(5.76)	8(5.24)	11
FIRST GENERATION MALES	8(5.24)	2(4.76)	10
TOTAL	11	10	21

Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 6

H_0 = There is no difference in ethnic scores between first generation females and second generation females.
H_1 = First generation females have higher ethnic scores than second generation females.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
SECOND GENERATION FEMALES	6(7.14)	9(7.86)	15
FIRST GENERATION FEMALES	4(2.86)	2(2.14)	6
TOTAL	10	11	21

Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 7

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of children of first generation males and children of second generation males.
H_1 = Children of first generation males have higher ethnic scores than children of second generation males.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
CHILDREN OF FIRST GENERATION MALES	10(8.22)	7(8.78)	17
CHILDREN OF SECOND GENERATION MALES	5(6.78)	9(7.22)	14
TOTAL	15	16	31

Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 8

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of children of first generation females and children of second generation females.
H_1 = Children of first generation females have higher ethnic scores than children of second generation females.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
CHILDREN OF FIRST GENERATION FEMALES	7(5.69)	4(5.31)	11
CHILDREN OF SECOND GENERATION FEMALES	8(9.31)	10(8.69)	18
TOTAL	15	14	29

Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 9

H_0 = There is no difference in ethnic scores between second generation males and second generation females.
H_1 = Second generation males have higher ethnic scores than second generation females.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
SECOND GENERATION FEMALES	6(5.19)	9(9.81)	15
SECOND GENERATION MALES	3(3.81)	8(7.19)	11
TOTAL	9	17	26

Not significant at .05 level.

NOTE:

In Table 8, the two children whose mother was not of Ukrainian ancestry were not included in the sample.

TABLE 10

H_0 = There is no difference in ethnic scores between older and younger children.
H_1 = Older children have higher ethnic scores than younger children.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
OLDER CHILDREN	13(11.65)	6(7.35)	19
YOUNGER CHILDREN	6(7.35)	6(4.65)	12
TOTAL	19	12	31

Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 11

H_0 = There is no difference in ethnic scores of adults with a high education and ethnic scores of adults with a low education.
H_1 = Adults with a low education have higher ethnic scores than adults with a high education.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
ADULTS WITH A LOW EDUCATION	13(11.5)	10(11.5)	23
ADULTS WITH A HIGH EDUCATION	8(8.5)	11(10.5)	19
TOTAL	21	21	42

Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 12

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of children whose parents have a high education and children whose parents have a low education.

H_1 = Children of parents with a low education have higher ethnic scores than children of parents with a high education.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
CHILDREN OF PARENTS WITH HIGH EDUCATION	7(8.23)	10(8.77)	17
CHILDREN OF PARENTS WITH LOW EDUCATION	8(6.77)	6(7.23)	14
TOTAL	15	16	31

Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 13

H_0 = There is no difference in the native language learned by second generation children and third generation children.
H_1 = The native language of third generation children is English.

	Ethnicity		
	Second Generation	Third Generation	Total
UKRAINIAN	15(8.77)	1(7.23)	16
ENGLISH	2(8.23)	13(6.77)	15
TOTAL	17	14	31

$x^2 = 17.12$

Significant at .001 level.

TABLE 14

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of children whose native language is Ukrainian and children whose native language is not Ukrainian.

H_1 = Children whose native language is Ukrainian will have higher ethnic scores.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
CHILDREN WHOSE NATIVE LANGUAGE IS UKRAINIAN	10(8.13)	4(5.87)	14
CHILDREN WHOSE NATIVE LANGUAGE IS ENGLISH	8(9.87)	9(7.13)	17
TOTAL	18	13	31

Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 15

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of adults who use English in the home and adults who use Ukrainian in the home.
H_1 = Adults using English in the home have lower ethnic scores.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
ADULTS USING ENGLISH IN THE HOME	7(12.57)	17(11.43)	24
ADULTS USING UKRAINIAN IN THE HOME	15(9.43)	3(8.57)	18
TOTAL	22	20	42

$x^2 = 9.90$

Significant at .01 level.

TABLE 16

H_0 = There is no difference between the ethnic scores of children whose parents use English in the home, and the ethnic scores of children whose parents use Ukrainian in the home.

H_1 = Children whose parents use English in the home have lower ethnic scores than children whose parents use Ukrainian in the home.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
CHILDREN WHOSE PARENTS USE ENGLISH IN THE HOME	6(9.19)	13(9.81)	19
CHILDREN WHOSE PARENTS USE UKRAINIAN IN THE HOME	9(5.81)	3(6.19)	12
TOTAL	15	16	31

$x^2 = 3.93$

Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 17

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of children who use English in the home and children who use Ukrainian in the home.
H_1 = Children who use English in the home have lower ethnic scores.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
CHILDREN WHO USE ENGLISH IN THE HOME	9(11.6)	15(12.4)	24
CHILDREN WHO USE UKRAINIAN IN THE HOME	6(3.4)	1(3.6)	7
TOTAL	15	16	31

Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 18

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of adults who speak another Slavic language and adults who do not.
H_1 = Adults who speak another Slavic language have high ethnic scores.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
ADULTS WHO SPEAK ANOTHER SLAVIC LANGUAGE	9(5.5)	2(5.5)	11
ADULTS WHO DO NOT SPEAK ANOTHER SLAVIC LANGUAGE	12(15.5)	19(15.5)	31
TOTAL	21	21	42

$x^2 = 4.43$

Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 19

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of children whose parents speak another Slavic language and children whose parents do not speak another Slavic language.

H_1 = Children whose parents speak another Slavic language have high ethnic scores.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
CHILDREN WHOSE PARENTS SPEAK ANOTHER SLAVIC LANGUAGE	9(5.81)	3(6.19)	12
CHILDREN WHOSE PARENTS TO NOT SPEAK ANOTHER SLAVIC LANGUAGE	6(9.19)	13(9.81)	19
TOTAL	15	16	31

$x^2 = 3.93$

Significant at .05 level.

TABLE 20

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of children currently studying French and children not studying French.
H_1 = Children currently studying French have high ethnic scores.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
CHILDREN STUDYING FRENCH	12(8.23)	5(8.77)	17
CHILDREN NOT STUDYING FRENCH	3(6.77)	11(7.23)	14
TOTAL	15	16	31

$x^2 = 5.58$

Significant at .02 level.

TABLE 21

H_0 = There is no difference with respect to dogmatic attitudes on out-marriage between first and second generation adults.
H_1 = First generation adults are more dogmatic than second generation adults where out-marriage is concerned.

	Ethnicity		
	First Generation	Second Generation	Total
DOGMATIC ATTITUDES	13(7.24)	6(11.76)	19
NON-DOGMATIC ATTITUDES	3(8.76)	20(14.24)	23
TOTAL	16	26	42

$x^2 = 11.27$

Significant at .001 level.

TABLE 22

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of adults who attend church frequently and adults who do not attend frequently.
H_1 = Adults who attend church frequently have high ethnic scores.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
ADULTS WHO ATTEND CHURCH FREQUENTLY	17(15.71)	13(14.29)	30
ADULTS WHO DO NOT ATTEND CHURCH FREQUENTLY	5(6.29)	7(5.71)	12
TOTAL	22	20	42

Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 23

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of children who attend church frequently and children who do not.
H_1 = Children who attend church frequently have high ethnic scores.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
CHILDREN WHO ATTEND CHURCH FREQUENTLY	13(10.65)	9(11.35)	22
CHILDREN WHO DO NOT ATTEND CHURCH FREQUENTLY	2(4.35)	7(4.65)	9
TOTAL	15	16	31

Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 24

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of adults who participate in ethnic organizations and adults who do not.
H_1 = Adults who participate in ethnic organizations have high ethnic scores.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
ADULTS WHO PARTICIPATE IN ETHNIC ORGANIZATIONS	13(10.0)	8(11.0)	21
ADULTS WHO DO NOT PARTICIPATE IN ETHNIC ORGANIZATIONS	7(10.0)	14(11.0)	21
TOTAL	20	22	42

Not significant at .05 level.

TABLE 25

H_0 = There is no difference in the ethnic scores of children who participate in ethnic organizations and children who do not participate.
H_1 = Children who participate in ethnic organizations have high ethnic scores.

	Ethnicity		
	High Scores	Low Scores	Total
CHILDREN WHO PARTICIPATE IN ETHNIC ORGANIZATIONS	9(6.77)	5(7.23)	14
CHILDREN WHO DO NOT PARTICIPATE IN ETHNIC ORGANIZATIONS	6(8.23)	11(8.77)	17
TOTAL	15	16	31

Not significant at .05 level.